

CA20N
DT 130
-1991
S77

Government
Publication



Survey of Suspended Drivers in Ontario

April, 1991
SCDO 91-113
ISBN 0-7729-8535-9



Ministry
of
Transportation

Ontario


Survey of Suspended Drivers in Ontario

J. Matsui
Environics Research Group

L. Clifford
D. Duncan
Ministry of Transportation

April, 1991
SCDO 91-113
ISBN 0-7729-8535-9





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761118924083>

ABSTRACT

The Safety Co-ordination and Development Office of the Ontario Ministry of Transportation retained Environics Research Group of Toronto to conduct a study of drivers who had their licenses suspended in 1986. The study consisted of two research phases: 1) the coding, data entry and analysis of the Driver Records of 4,616 randomly selected suspended drivers; and 2) in-depth telephone interviews with 1,511 suspended drivers. The interviews were conducted from Environics' computer-assisted telephone interviewing facility (CATI) during March and April of 1988.

The findings indicate that the typical suspended driver in Ontario is a young, single male who is working full- or part-time. One half of the drivers with a suspension in 1986 had at least one other suspension between 1981 and 1986. On average, each suspended driver had received 3.7 convictions for vehicle-related offences over the previous five-year period (excluding the conviction that led to the 1986 suspension).

The Driver Records analysis shows that 11 percent of suspended drivers had contact with the police while driving during their 1986 suspension. This percentage would be considered the minimum estimate of the number who drove during their suspension.

When respondents were asked during their telephone interviews whether they had driven during their 1986 suspension, 34 percent admitted that they knowingly broke their suspension. An additional 23 percent drove during their suspension, but unknowingly, because they had not yet received notification of their suspension. After receiving notification, they did not drive at all.

Individuals who knowingly drove during their suspension tended to drive less frequently and more cautiously than normal.

ABRÉGÉ

Le Bureau du développement et de la coordination de la sécurité routière du ministère ontarien des Transports a commandé à la firme torontoise Environics Research Group une enquête sur les conducteurs qui ont fait l'objet d'une suspension de permis en 1986. L'enquête comportait deux volets : 1) codage, mise en mémoire et analyse du dossier de conduite d'un échantillon aléatoire de 4 616 conducteurs ayant fait l'objet d'une suspension de permis et 2) enquête approfondie par téléphone auprès de 1 511 conducteurs ayant fait l'objet d'une suspension de permis. Ces appels téléphoniques ont été donnés du centre d'enquête téléphonique assistée par ordinateur d'Environics, en mars et avril 1988.

Les résultats révèlent que le conducteur type ayant fait l'objet d'une suspension de permis en Ontario est un homme, jeune, célibataire, travaillant à plein temps ou à temps partiel. La moitié des conducteurs ayant fait l'objet d'une suspension de permis en 1986 avaient déjà fait l'objet d'au moins une autre suspension de permis entre 1981 et 1986. En moyenne, chacun avait été condamné à 3,7 reprises pour contravention aux règlements de circulation routière au cours des cinq années précédentes (sans compter la condamnation ayant entraîné la suspension de permis de 1986).

L'analyse des dossiers de conduite révèle que 11 pour cent de ces conducteurs se sont fait prendre au volant par la police pendant leur suspension de permis de 1986. On peut donc considérer ce chiffre comme le pourcentage minimum des conducteurs ayant fait l'objet d'une suspension de permis qui ont conduit pendant cette suspension.

Quand, lors de la conversation téléphonique, on a demandé aux personnes interrogées si elles avaient conduit pendant leur suspension de 1986, 34 pour cent d'entre elles ont reconnu avoir sciemment violé la suspension. En outre, 23 pour cent ont déclaré avoir conduit pendant la suspension, mais à leur insu, n'ayant, à ce moment-là, pas encore reçu avis de la suspension de permis. Par la suite, celles-là n'ont plus conduit.

Les personnes qui ont enfreint sciemment la suspension de permis ont déclaré avoir en ces circonstances pris le volant moins fréquemment et conduit plus prudemment qu'à l'ordinaire.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.2 STUDY OBJECTIVES	1
1.3 STUDY DESIGN	2
1.4 SURVEY METHODOLOGY	3
<u>DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SUSPENDED DRIVERS</u>	4
2.1 INTRODUCTION	4
2.2 GENDER	4
2.3 AGE	4
2.4 REGION	5
2.5 COMMUNITY SIZE	6
2.6 MARITAL STATUS	6
2.7 TENURE	7
2.8 LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME	7
2.9 OTHER DRIVERS IN THE HOUSEHOLD	7
2.10 THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC VARIABLES: EDUCATION, WORK STATUS, OCCUPATION AND INCOME	8
2.10.1 Education	8
2.10.2 Work Status	9
2.10.3 Occupation	9
2.10.4 Income	10
<u>LICENSE CHARACTERISTICS</u>	11
3.1 LICENSE CLASS	11
3.2 YEARS SINCE ISSUE OF ORIGINAL LICENSE	11
<u>CURRENT DRIVING HABITS</u>	13
4.1 FREQUENCY AND DISTANCE	13
4.2 TRIP PURPOSE	13
4.3 WORK-RELATED DRIVING	14
4.4 SELF-EVALUATION OF DRIVING SKILL	14
<u>1981 TO 1986 DRIVING RECORD</u>	16
5.1 PREVIOUS SUSPENSIONS	16
5.2 PREVIOUS COLLISIONS	16
5.3 PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS	17
<u>1986 DRIVER'S LICENSE SUSPENSION</u>	19
6.1 INTRODUCTION	19
6.2 LENGTH OF SUSPENSION	19
6.3 LEARNING ABOUT THEIR SUSPENSION	20
6.4 DIFFICULTIES CREATED BY 1986 LICENSE SUSPENSION	21
6.4.1 Major Disruptions	21
6.4.2 Difficulties in Undertaking Daily Activities	22

6.5	ESTIMATES OF THE PERCENTAGE WHO DROVE WHILE SUSPENDED	23
6.5.1	Driver Record Evidence of Driving While Under Suspension	23
6.5.2	Convictions During Suspension	23
6.5.3	Collisions During Suspension	24
6.5.4	Suspensions During Suspension	24
6.5.5	Self-Reports of Driving While Under Suspension	25
6.6	PEOPLE WHO ADMIT DRIVING OR WERE CAUGHT BY THE POLICE	26
6.6.1	Incidence by Suspension Group	26
6.6.2	Demographic Profile	26
6.6.3	Driving History and Characteristics	27
6.7	PEOPLE WHO STOPPED DRIVING WHEN THEY FOUND OUT ABOUT THEIR SUSPENSION	27
6.7.1	Incidence by Suspension Group	27
6.7.2	Demographic Profile	27
6.7.3	Driving History and Characteristics	28
6.8	PEOPLE WHO DID NOT DRIVE	28
6.8.1	Incidence by Suspension Group	28
6.8.2	Demographic Profile	28
6.8.3	Driving History and Characteristics	29

	<u>DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED</u>	33
7.1	INTRODUCTION	33
7.2	WHEN THEY STARTED DRIVING	33
7.2.1	Time and Circumstances	33
7.2.2	Differences by Suspension Group	33
7.3	FREQUENCY OF DRIVING	34
7.4	REASONS FOR DRIVING	35
7.5	CHANGE IN DRIVING HABITS	35
7.5.1	Driving Patterns	35
7.5.2	Changes by Suspension Group	36
7.6	REASONS FOR CHANGING DRIVING HABITS	37
7.6.1	The Motivational Factors	37
7.6.2	Differences by Suspension Group	37
7.7	ALTERNATIVES TO DRIVING	38
7.8	CONTACT WITH THE POLICE	39
7.8.1	The Situations	39
7.8.2	The Consequences	40

	<u>NOT DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED</u>	41
8.1	INTRODUCTION	41
8.2	USE OF ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION	41
8.3	REASONS FOR NOT DRIVING	42

	<u>THE ATTITUDES OF SUSPENDED DRIVERS</u>	45
9.1	INTRODUCTION	45
9.2	SERIOUSNESS OF DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED	45
9.3	WAS LICENSE SUSPENSION AS A PUNISHMENT JUSTIFIED?	46
9.4	SITUATIONS WHEN A SUSPENDED DRIVER IS JUSTIFIED DRIVING	47
9.5	PENALTIES FOR DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED	48
9.5.1	Awareness and Knowledge of the Penalties	48
9.5.2	Opinions about the Effectiveness of the Penalties	49
9.5.3	Reasons for Ineffectiveness	50

9.6	PREVENTING SUSPENDED DRIVERS FROM DRIVING	51
9.6.1	Effectiveness of Different Measures	51
9.6.2	Most Effective Measure	52
9.7	PHOTO IDENTIFICATION ON DRIVER'S LICENSES	54
0	<u>POST-1986 DRIVING RECORD</u>	55
10.1	INTRODUCTION	55
10.2	SUSPENSIONS	55
10.3	COLLISIONS	55
10.4	CONVICTIONS	55
0	<u>SUSPENSION GROUP SUMMARIES</u>	57

APPENDIX A - METHODOLOGY
APPENDIX B - QUESTIONNAIRE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to undertake a study of drivers who had their licenses suspended in 1986. The study was undertaken in two phases.

Phase I entailed the coding, data entry and analysis of the driver records of a random sample of suspended drivers.

Phase II was composed of in-depth telephone interviews with a subsample of suspended drivers from Phase I.

The telephone interviewing was conducted during March and April 1988 from Envirionics' computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) facility located in downtown Toronto.

The Phase I Driver Record Analysis was designed to examine the objective information contained in the Ministry's master Driver File for six suspension groups (Criminal Code, Fine Default, Probationary Demerit, Demerit, Medical and Other suspensions). This data included previous suspensions, convictions and accidents, reasons for the 1986 suspension and post-1986 driving record. A limited amount of demographic information was also obtained from the Driver Record Analysis.

The unique part of this study involved linking electronically the information from the driver records with the telephone interviews composing Phase II. Data from the driver records were brought forward to the CATI interview in order to remind the respondent of the events in 1986 and to verify selected responses.

Demographic Profile of Suspended Drivers

The typical suspended driver in Ontario is a young (25-35 years of age), single male who is working either full- or part-time. Furthermore, suspended drivers tend to work in blue collar occupations, particularly in the skilled trades.

The distribution of suspended drivers is spread across the province; that is, there are no regions of Ontario with either extremely high or low concentrations of suspended drivers.

Driver Characteristics

Ninety percent of suspended drivers hold a "G-class" license. On the whole, suspended drivers do not have a great deal of driving experience (50 percent have been driving for less than 10 years). Most suspended drivers, however, have a heavy reliance on the use of vehicles (80 percent drive daily). A substantial number of suspended drivers use a vehicle as part of their work.

Driving Record

One-half of those who had their licenses suspended in 1986 had at least one other suspension during the previous five years. Many individuals had been suspended previously for the same reason as their 1986 suspension.

Approximately fifty percent had been involved in a collision between 1981 and 1986. As well, a large majority of suspended drivers had a least one conviction, excluding the conviction that led to their 1986 suspension. On average, each suspended driver had received 3.7 convictions over the five-year period.

Characteristics of the 1986 Suspension

On average, drivers had their licenses suspended for six months. One-half of suspended drivers who were interviewed by telephone had found out about their suspension either before or at the time of their suspension. Forty-three percent indicated not knowing about their suspension until after it had already come into effect. The remainder were unable to recall the circumstances surrounding their 1986 suspension.

The majority of survey respondents reported difficulties and disruptions in their personal lives because of their license suspension.

Driving While Suspended

The analysis of driver records indicates that 11 percent of suspended drivers had contact with the police while driving during their suspension period. This estimate of the number who drive while suspended would be considered the minimum or floor estimate.

When respondents were asked during the telephone interview whether or not they had driven during their 1986 suspension, 34 percent report knowing that their license was under suspension and admit driving anyway.

An additional 23 percent indicate driving during their suspension but unknowingly -- they had not received notification of their suspension until after it had already begun. Upon receiving notification, these respondents indicate that they stopped driving.

The remaining 41 percent report that they did not drive at all.

Individuals with either a Demerit or Fine Default suspension are the most likely to drive while suspended (over 40 percent). Furthermore, they tend to be better educated, earn higher incomes, work in the skilled trades and to drive as part of their job.

Those who stopped driving after learning about their suspension share the same demographic profile as those who knowingly drove. There is a relatively high representation of drivers with a Fine Default suspension in this group.

The highest degree of compliance to a suspension is found among individuals with a Medical, Criminal Code or Probationary Demerit suspension. From a demographic perspective, those who did not drive are the opposite of those who chose to continue driving.

Changes in Driving Habits While Under Suspension

Two-thirds of those who drove during their suspension said they drove less frequently and more cautiously than they were normally accustomed.

Probationary Demerit and Demerit suspensions were the most likely to have changed some aspect of their driving patterns.

Those who did not drive during their suspension relied upon rides from family or friends. They also coped by traveling less frequently.

General Attitudes of Suspended Drivers

Suspended drivers, in general, do not consider driving while suspended to be a very serious offense. Those who did not drive during their suspension, however, are likely to regard this offense as more serious than those who drove.

Less than one-third of suspended drivers believe that the current penalties for driving while under suspension are very effective deterrents. Jail sentences for repeat offenders, an increase in random police spot checks and impounding the cars of suspended drivers are seen as effective countermeasures.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

In the province of Ontario, drivers who are caught committing one or more of various driving or administrative infractions are subject to the temporary suspension of their driver's licenses. The ultimate purpose of license suspension is to improve road safety. License suspension accomplishes this goal in two ways. Primarily, it protects other road users by removing unsafe or high risk drivers from the road. As a secondary role, license suspensions deter other road users from performing the actions that are dangerous to other drivers or detrimental to the driving system in Ontario.

License suspensions must be observed by the offending drivers in order to effectively fulfil the two functions mentioned above. If the terms of the suspensions are not being observed by the suspended drivers, then some unsafe drivers may still remain on the road and the effectiveness of suspensions as a deterrent to these and other drivers is reduced.

In Ontario in 1986, the breakdown of suspensions by the reason for suspension was as follows:

Fine Default

- o Non-payment of fines related to traffic convictions other than parking violations
- o 49,805 suspensions for default of fine payments

Criminal Code

- o Federal offences dealing mainly with drinking and driving, dangerous driving and criminal negligence
- o 25,128 suspensions for Criminal Code convictions

Probationary Demerit

- o Applies to new drivers upon accumulation of six demerit points for traffic convictions
- o 15,037 suspensions for probationary demerit point accumulations

Demerit Point

- o Applies to non-probationary drivers upon accumulation of 15 demerit points for traffic convictions
- o 3,268 suspensions for demerit point accumulations

Medical

- o Applies to any medical conditions such as epilepsy, heart condition or alcoholism that might make it dangerous to operate a motor vehicle
- o 3,389 suspensions for medical reasons

Other

- o Miscellaneous convictions including failing to have insurance, making false statements or court-ordered suspensions

- o 1,985 suspensions for other reasons

Research from other jurisdictions indicates that license suspension is not always the most effective countermeasure by which to ensure road safety. Beyond those drivers caught and charged with driving while under suspension, there is also a significant proportion of suspended drivers who continue to drive undetected.

In response to this situation, the Ministry of Transportation retained Environics Research Group Limited in December, 1987, to undertake a study of suspended drivers in Ontario to determine the extent and frequency of driving while suspended.

1.2 STUDY OBJECTIVES

The specific objectives of this study are to:

- o determine the extent and frequency of driving while under suspension in Ontario;
- o identify the socio-economic, demographic, driving and motivational characteristics of those who do and do not drive while suspended;
- o determine the relationships between the reason for suspension and the length of suspension, and the degree of compliance with suspension;
- o determine the number of drivers caught for other offences but not charged for driving while suspended; and,
- o determine the reasons and motivations behind the decision to drive or not to drive while under suspension.

1.3 STUDY DESIGN

The first phase of the study consisted of an analysis of 4,616 driving records of a sample of drivers receiving or serving suspensions in 1986. The sample was randomly selected by the Ministry from its driver record files. From the driving records of suspended drivers in the study sample, Environics compiled the number of violations, accidents and suspensions which occurred during the 1986 suspension period, during the five-year period before the 1986 suspension and during the period between the end of the 1986 suspension and January, 1988.

The second phase consisted of a telephone survey of 1,500 suspended drivers across Ontario from the same sample. The topics covered in the survey included the respondent's previous driving characteristics and experience, how the respondent first learned of the suspension, the disruptions to daily life caused by the suspension, the extent and frequency of driving while suspended as well as the reasons for the respondent's decision to drive or not to drive, changes in driving

habits if driving under suspension and attitudes towards license suspension as an effective road safety measure.

The questions regarding the extent and frequency of driving while suspended were approached in such a way as to reduce the perceived threatening nature of the questions and avoid the situation in which a respondent would have had to directly admit to breaking the law. Respondents were asked whether or not they had been suspended in 1986 and how much they had driven since that time. The illegality of such actions were not implied or explicitly stated in the questioning. Further questions on the trips made, if any, and the reasons for driving or not driving followed the pattern established in similar questions in an earlier section.

Methodologically, this study is unique because driver record information for each driver in the sample was embedded into a computer-assisted telephone interview, making this information available during the interview. Certain items of information obtained from the driver records analysis were precoded for each potential respondent in the telephone survey. The integration of the information into the interview was automatic and transparent to both the interviewer and the respondent. The precoded information included:

- o name, address and telephone number;
- o whether the potential respondent was currently under suspension or has already served the suspension;
- o reason for suspension (i.e. suspension group);
- o the start and end dates of the 1986 suspension; and,
- o whether any contact with the police was made during the suspension period (e.g. traffic violation, collision).

1.4 SURVEY METHODOLOGY

During the period of March 10 to April 14, 1988, Environics Research Group conducted a survey of 1,511 Ontario drivers who had their driver's licenses suspended at least once in 1986.

The questionnaire used in this survey was designed by Environics Research Group in consultation with the Safety Coordination and Development Office of the Ministry of Transportation.

The survey was conducted by experienced telephone interviewers from Environics' central location telephone facility in downtown Toronto using advanced computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) technology.

The number of interviews completed by suspension group were:

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	Margin of <u>error</u>
Fine Default	506	33	4.4%
Criminal Code	317	21	5.5
Probationary Demerit	245	16	6.3
Demerit	152	10	8.0
Medical	150	10	8.0
Other	141	9	8.0
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	1,511	100	(2.5)

The margin of error for a sample of 1,511 within a universe of 121,100 is plus or minus 2.5 percent at the 95 percent confidence limit. The margin of error increases for the data generated in subgroups of the total sample (for example, suspension type or socio-demographic).

A detailed description of the survey methodology is found in Appendix A.

2.0 DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SUSPENDED DRIVERS

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Information from the Driver Records database was used to construct gender, age and region profiles of suspended drivers as a whole and within each suspension group. Subsequently, interviews were conducted with 1,511 suspended drivers (weighted N=1,510). During this interview, nine additional demographic questions were asked. These questions concern:

1. education;
2. employment status;
3. occupation;
4. household income;
5. community size
6. marital status;
7. tenure;
8. language spoken in the home; and,
9. number of licensed drivers in the household.

2.2 GENDER

Suspended drivers are overwhelmingly male. Nine out of ten drivers who had their license suspended in 1986 are male, while only one out of ten is female.

The very high percentage of males is repeated in each of the five suspension groups. The percentage of males is highest within the Demerit suspension group (97% are male), while the percentage of females is highest in the Medical suspension group (19% are female).

2.3 AGE

In comparison to the general adult population of the province, suspended drivers cluster in the younger age groups with very few individuals in the older age groups. Seventy-two percent of suspended drivers are less than 35 years of age. The mean age of suspended drivers as a whole is 32.5 years of age. Only eleven percent of suspended drivers are more than 45 years of age.

There are significant variations in age across the suspension groups. As would be expected, members of the Probationary Demerit suspension group are the youngest (76% are between 16 and 24 years of age, mean age of 23.6 years). Three suspension groups - Demerit (on average, 30

years), Fine Default (30.9 years) and Other (32.4 years) - are close to the average of all suspended drivers (32.5 years).

The remaining two suspension groups are older than the norm. Members of the Criminal Code suspension group, on average, are 35.5 years of age (20% are 45 years of age or older) and members of the Medical suspension group are, on average, 49.6 years of age (51% are 45 years of age or older).

2.4 REGION

Suspended drivers reside throughout Ontario with heavier concentrations in the more densely populated regions (31% live in Central Ontario and an additional 21% in Metro Toronto). For the most part, the distribution of suspended drivers across the province is close to the distribution of the general population.

Furthermore, the distribution of suspension groups in each of the five regions of the province is generally uniform; that is, no one type of suspension group predominates in any one area of the province.

Compared to the overall provincial distribution of suspended drivers, there is a slight over-representation of the Medical suspension group in Eastern Ontario (4 points above the provincial average), a very modest over-representation of Fine Defaults in Central Ontario and Metro Toronto (3 points and 4 points above the provincial average, respectively), Demerit suspensions in Western Ontario and Northern Ontario (5 points above the provincial average) and Criminal Code suspensions in Northern Ontario (5 points above the average).

TABLE 1
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS
(Vertical Percentages Based on 4,616 Driver Records)

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
<u>Gender</u>							
Male	90	93	97	90	81	72	95
Female	10	7	3	10	19	11	5
<u>Age</u>							
16-24	29	15	30	76	7	24	17
25-34	43	44	50	18	24	49	53
35-44	17	21	13	4	18	20	18
45+	11	20	7	2	51	8	13
Average	32.5	35.5	30.0	23.6	49.6	30.9	32.4
<u>Region</u>							
East	13	16	15	12	17	11	13
Central	31	28	23	30	28	34	31
Metro	21	12	20	20	17	25	23
Western	22	26	27	24	23	19	18
Northern	9	14	14	9	11	6	10

2.5 COMMUNITY SIZE

Suspended drivers tend to reside in smaller urban centres compared to the Ontario population at large. Fifty-one percent of suspended drivers reside in communities over 100,000 in contrast to 61 percent of the total population. Almost twice as many suspended drivers as the population at large live in communities between 10,000 and 100,000 (23% of suspended drivers versus 13% of the general population). Slightly fewer suspended drivers than the general population live in communities less than 10,000.

Four suspension groups - Demerit, Probationary Demerit, Medical and Other - are distributed across different sized communities in roughly the same proportions as suspended drivers as a whole. Alternatively, heavier concentrations of Criminal Code suspensions are found in smaller communities, while a larger number of Fine Defaults are found in the larger urban centres.

2.6 MARITAL STATUS

Compared to the adult population of Ontario, there are much greater percentages of single, never married individuals among suspended drivers (44% of suspended drivers versus 25% of the general population). Correspondingly, there are lower percentages of married individuals among suspended drivers (44% of suspended drivers versus 59% of the general population) and lower percentages of previously married individuals (11% of suspended drivers versus 16% of the general population).

The pattern of a high percentage of single, never married individuals is even more evident among members of the Probationary Demerit (78%) and the Demerit suspension groups (50%). There are about equal percentages of single and married individuals within the Fine Default group, with the balance shifting to a greater percentage of married over single individuals among Medical (59% married), Other (55%) and Criminal Code (51%) suspensions.

2.7 TENURE

Given that suspended drivers tend to be young and single, it appears reasonable that there is a greater percentage of renters among suspended drivers (53%) than is found in the general population (about one-third). Forty-six percent of suspended drivers own their dwellings, in contrast to two-thirds of the population at large.

As would be expected, suspension groups containing a large percentage of young adults are more likely to have a greater number of renters versus owners. It is only among the Medical suspension group that the owner-to-renter ratio approaches the level found in the general population of Ontario.

2.8 LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME

Over nine in ten suspended drivers indicate that English is the language usually spoken in their home. Two percent or fewer speak one of French, Italian, Portuguese or Spanish. Except for the Probationary Demerit suspension group, the percentage of English-speaking suspended drivers exceeds 90 percent.

2.9 OTHER DRIVERS IN THE HOUSEHOLD

About 80 percent of suspended drivers indicate that there is at least one other licensed driver in their household. Forty-four percent of suspended drivers report the presence of one other licensed driver, 17 percent two other drivers and 17 percent three or more drivers in their households.

It is only among drivers with a Medical suspension that there is a significantly higher percentage reporting no other licensed drivers in their household. One-third of respondents with a Medical suspension indicate that there are no other drivers in their household.

Table 2
OTHER DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS
(Vertical Percentages Based on 1,510 Interviews)

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
<u>Community Size</u>							
Less than 10,000	22	30	23	20	29	17	22
10,000 - 100,000	23	34	27	27	22	16	24
100,000 - 500,000	26	20	22	28	27	30	25
More than 500,000	25	12	26	22	18	32	27
<u>Marital Status</u>							
Single	44	32	50	78	21	41	37
Married	44	51	43	19	59	47	55
Widowed, Separated, Divorced	11	18	7	3	19	11	8
<u>Tenure</u>							
Own	46	47	51	52	62	41	47
Rent	53	53	48	45	38	58	52
<u>Language at Home</u>							
English	91	91	93	86	94	91	91
Other	8	8	7	14	6	8	9
<u>Other Household Drivers</u>							
None	21	23	10	14	32	21	19
One	44	54	44	25	48	44	55
Two	17	12	24	27	14	17	9
Three or More	17	10	22	34	7	16	17

2.10 THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC VARIABLES: EDUCATION, WORK STATUS, OCCUPATION AND INCOME

2.10.1 Education

Suspended drivers tend to be less highly educated than the general adult population of the province. Smaller percentages of suspended drivers have attended university (15%) and larger percentages have less than a high school education (32%) than the population at large. There is, however, a higher representation of community college graduates among suspended drivers than in the adult population of Ontario.

Four suspension groups - Criminal Code, Medical, Probationary Demerit and Other - are characterized by lower educational standing than the public at large. Seventy percent of the Criminal Code suspension group, 65 percent of the Medical Group and 64 percent of the Other group have high school educations or less. The very high percentage of the Probationary Demerit group with a high school education (43%) can be attributed in part, to their young age.

The Demerit suspension group has an exceptionally large number of community college graduates - 13 percent above the norm for suspended drivers as a whole. Approximately one-half of the Fine Default suspension group have post-secondary educations (24% have attended community college and 23% have attended university).

2.10.2 Work Status

The difference between suspended drivers and the Ontario population at large is quite marked regarding work status. Seventy-seven percent of suspended drivers are working full-time and an additional seven percent are working part-time.

The percentage of suspended drivers who work is about 20 points higher than in the general adult population. The percentages of homemakers and the retired consequently are much less than in the population at large.

The high levels of employment are maintained in four of the six suspension groups (Fine Default 92%, Demerit 88%, Other 84% and Criminal Code 71%). Within the Probationary Demerit group, there is an over-representation of individuals working part-time (16%) and attending school full-time (12%). One in three respondents with a Medical suspension is retired from the labour force. Although the large majority of individuals under Criminal Code suspension are employed, 14 percent are unemployed (6% above the average for suspended drivers).

2.10.3 Occupation

The differences in the educational attainment of suspended drivers and the adult population of Ontario is reflected clearly in the type of jobs held by each group. A much higher proportion of suspended drivers work in blue collar jobs than the population at-large, while a much smaller percentage work in professional, managerial and sales and clerical jobs.

Twenty-six percent of employed suspended drivers work in the skilled trades (double the percentage in the general population) and 35 percent work in unskilled jobs (about 20 points higher than the general population). Alternatively, only 17 percent of suspended drivers work in professional and managerial occupations (about 20 points lower than the general population) and 22 percent work in sales or clerical positions (about 10 points less than the provincial norm).

The very high percentage of suspended drivers who work in skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled jobs is found in five of the six suspension groups. It is only among individuals with either a Medical or Fine Default suspension that more than 20 percent of the employed work in professional or managerial positions. Nevertheless, even in these suspension groups, the percentages of professionals and managers are less than in the Ontario population at large.

2.10.4 Income

Despite the fact that suspended drivers have lower educational levels and work in less prestigious occupations than are found in the general population, their incomes are similar to the rest of the population. Thirty-six percent of suspended drivers earn less than \$30,000, 29 percent make between \$30,000 and \$50,000 and 27 percent earn more than \$50,000. It is only in the highest income category (more than \$50,000) that suspended drivers are slightly under-represented relative to the general population.

The incomes of four suspension groups - Demerit, Fine Default, Probationary Demerit and Other - exceed the provincial average family income of \$50,000. Lower incomes are found among respondents with a Criminal Code suspension (a higher percentage of unemployed) and those with a Medical suspension (a higher percentage of the retired).

TABLE 3
THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF SUSPENDED DRIVERS
(Vertical Percentages Based on 1,510 Interviews)

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
<u>Education</u>							
Public School	6	9	2	2	13	4	10
Some High School	26	32	18	25	25	23	32
High School	29	29	21	43	27	26	22
Community College	23	23	36	17	18	24	24
University	15	8	22	13	16	23	12
<u>Work Status</u>							
Work Full-time	77	71	82	65	45	86	82
Work Part-time	7	6	6	16	8	6	2
Student	4	4	4	12	2	2	3
Homemaker	1	2	2	-	5	1	1
Unemployed	8	14	6	7	8	5	6
Retired	3	5	2	-	31	-	5
<u>Occupation</u>							
Professional/ Managerial	17	9	19	6	27	21	19
Sales, Clerical	22	14	29	27	30	23	16
Skilled/ Semi-skilled	26	32	30	25	16	24	28
Unskilled	35	41	24	43	25	31	36
<u>Income</u>							
Less than \$20K	17	26	15	11	35	13	17
\$20K-\$30K	19	21	16	17	24	19	16
\$30K-\$40K	16	15	15	21	14	15	19
\$40K-\$50K	13	14	12	13	10	13	15
More than \$50K	27	17	37	28	10	34	25

3.0 LICENSE CHARACTERISTICS

3.1 LICENSE CLASS

Nine out of ten suspended drivers hold a G-class (car, light truck) license. Much smaller percentages of suspended drivers hold either an M-class (motorcycle) license (15%), a D-class (heavy trucks) license (5%) or an A-class (tractor trailer) license (3%).

Approximately nine of ten individuals in each of the six suspension groups have a G-class license. The percentage holding a G-class license ranges from 85 percent of the Other suspension group to 93 percent of the Medical suspension group.

The highest percentage of any suspension group holding a M-class license occurs within the Demerit suspension group. Twenty-seven percent of the members of this particular suspension group hold a M-class license (12 points above the provincial average).

For the remaining three license classes -- D-, A- and C-class licenses -- the percentage of any suspension group holding these licenses does not exceed eight percent.

TABLE 4
LICENSE CLASS
(Driver Records, N=4,616)
(Vertical Percentages Based on 4,616 Driver Records)*

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
G-Class	88	86	91	92	93	88	85
M-Class	15	14	27	13	5	15	22
D-Class	6	7	5	1	2	6	8
A-Class	3	3	4	1	1	4	4
C-Class	1	-	-	-	-	1	1

* Percentages may total more than 100% because drivers may hold more than one class of license

3.2 YEARS SINCE ISSUE OF ORIGINAL LICENSE

The length of time since the respondent first received an Ontario Driver's License would be considered a surrogate measure for age; that is, individuals who are older generally have been driving longer.

On average, suspended drivers have had an Ontario license for 9.4 years. Just as earlier analyses have shown that suspended drivers tend to be younger, suspended drivers also tend to have fewer years of driving experience (51% have less than 10 years experience). Only 16 percent of suspended drivers have had a driver's license for more than 15 years.

As shown in earlier analyses, Probationary Demerit suspensions involve younger drivers, while Demerit, Fine Default and Other suspensions involve drivers in the middle-range age categories and Medical suspensions involve older drivers. Analysis by length of time holding an Ontario Drivers' License reveals approximately the same pattern of findings.

Drivers who have received a Probationary Demerit suspension, on average, have been driving the shortest length of time (4.3 years), followed by those with a Demerit suspension (9.6 years), Fine Default suspension (10.1 years), Other suspension (10.9 years) and Criminal Code suspension (11.0 years). Finally, those with a Medical suspension have driven the longest amount of time (12.7 years).

4.0 CURRENT DRIVING HABITS

4.1 FREQUENCY AND DISTANCE

Survey respondents were asked about their regular driving patterns when they are not under suspension. Survey respondents are heavy users of vehicles, indicating a degree of dependence on cars and trucks for out-of-home travel. Eight of ten respondents indicate that they drive on a daily basis when not under suspension.

Respondents from the Demerit or Fine Default groups are the most frequent drivers when not under suspension, while individuals from the Medical group travel the least often.

Although the majority of drivers travel less than 250 kilometers per week, there is a substantial percentage driving more than 500 kilometers per week. Fifteen percent of drivers use their vehicles between 500 and 1,000 kilometers per week, while an additional 12 percent are driving more than 1,000 kilometers weekly.

As with frequency of driving, individuals from the Other, Demerit or Fine Default groups tend to drive greater distances per week when not under suspension.

TABLE 5
CURRENT DRIVING CHARACTERISTICS

	All Drivers (N=1,510) %
<hr/>	
<u>Frequency of Driving</u>	
Daily	79
Weekly	10
Less Frequently	3
Not Driving	9
 <u>Distance Travelled Per Week</u>	
Less than 100 km	33
100-250 km	23
250-500 km	17
500-1,000 km	15
More than 1,000 km	12

4.2 TRIP PURPOSE

The single most important reason for driving when not under suspension concerns work-related travel (79% of 1986 suspended drivers). Of these individuals who drive for work-related reasons, two-thirds are commuting between home and work and one-third are driving as part of their job. Individuals from the Fine Default, Demerit or Other groups are the most likely to be driving for work-related reasons.

Smaller percentages of survey respondents are driving for non-work-related reasons. Ten percent drive principally to recreational or leisure destinations, eight percent drive to go shopping or attend to personal business and four percent use their vehicles to go to school or to classes. Respondents from the Medical suspension group are the most likely to be driving for personal, social or recreational reasons when not under suspension, while those with a Probationary Demerit suspension are the most likely to be driving to and from school.

TABLE 6
DRIVING CHARACTERISTICS

	All Drivers (N=1,510) %
<u>Trip Purpose</u>	
Commuting	51
As part of job	28
School, classes	4
Pleasure, social	10
Shopping, personal	8

4.3 WORK-RELATED DRIVING

When survey respondents are asked a follow-up question regarding whether they currently need to drive as part of their job, such as driving a taxi or a truck, 43 percent indicate that driving is an essential part of their work. Among the subsample of 1986 suspended drivers who currently are employed full- or part-time, 51 percent report that driving is a critical aspect of making their living.

Respondents with 1986 Other, Fine Default and Demerit suspensions are the most dependent on driving as an essential part of their work. Fifty percent or more of the employed in these three suspension groups rely heavily on their ability to drive in order to earn a living.

TABLE 7
DRIVING AS PART OF JOB

	All Drivers (N=1,510) %	Employed Full- or Part-Time (N=1,268) %
Yes	43	51
No	57	49

4.4 SELF-EVALUATION OF DRIVING SKILL

More than one-half of the study group believes that their driving skills are above average. An additional 42 percent rate their skills as average. Only one percent of survey respondents evaluate their driving skills as below average.

Individuals in the three suspension groups indicating frequent driving and high "kilometrage" per week - Fine Default, Demerit and Other - are also the individuals who are the most likely to be confident in their personal driving skills. At least six of ten members of these three suspension groups rate their driving skills as above average.

TABLE 8
SELF-EVALUATION OF DRIVING SKILL

All Drivers
(N=1,510)

%

Above average	57
Average	42
Below average	1

5.0 1981 TO 1986 DRIVING RECORD

5.1 PREVIOUS SUSPENSIONS

Nearly one-half of drivers (49%) who had their licenses suspended in 1986 had at least one prior suspension between 1981 and 1986. Three in ten suspended drivers had received a Fine Default suspension and 17 percent had received a Criminal Code suspension. Fewer than ten percent of suspended drivers had received one of the remaining five types of suspensions (7% received a Probationary Demerit suspension, 6% for driving while suspended; 6% received a Demerit suspension; 2% received an Other suspension and 1% received a Medical suspension).

Drivers who had received either a Fine Default or an Other suspension are the most likely to have received a previous suspension (58% and 54%, respectively). About one-half of those receiving a Demerit or Medical suspension had had an earlier suspension (49% and 47%, respectively), while 44 percent of drivers with a Criminal Code suspension and 25 percent with a Probationary Demerit suspension had been suspended between 1981 and 1986.

Furthermore, there is a relatively high degree of repeating a previous suspension. Thirty-two percent of 1986 drivers had been suspended for the same reason within the previous five years. The highest levels of repeating previous suspensions occur within the Fine Default suspension group (44% of 1986 Fine Defaults had a previous Fine Default suspension), and the Criminal Code suspension group (29% of 1986 Criminal Code suspensions had an earlier Criminal Code suspension). A history of receiving the same suspension is lower within the Demerit suspension group (18% repeating), the Medical suspension group (17% repeating), the Probationary Demerit group (15% repeating) and the Other suspension group (11% repeating).

An additional 16 percent of suspended drivers had incurred a previous suspension that was different from their 1986 suspension. This figure does not include individuals who received a suspension for the same reason and another suspension for a different reason as their 1986 suspension. About one-third of the Demerit suspension group earlier had received a Fine Default suspension. As well, one-third of the Other suspension group had received a Fine Default suspension. Three in ten members of the Medical suspension group had received a prior Criminal Code suspension.

5.2 PREVIOUS COLLISIONS

There is approximately 50 percent probability that a suspended driver would have been involved in at least one collision in the previous five years. The highest percentage of any suspension group with a prior accident history occurs within the Demerit suspension group (69% have been involved in a collision), followed by the Other suspension group (60%), the Probationary Demerit group (56%), the Criminal Code group (49%), the Fine Default group (46%) and, finally, the Medical group (37%).

5.3 PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS

Eighty percent or more of those who had received either a Demerit, Fine Default, Other, Probationary Demerit or Criminal Code suspension in 1986 have had at least one previous conviction. This figure does not include the conviction that led to the 1986 suspension on which this study is based.

All the members of the Demerit suspension group have had at least one conviction. In fact, each individual averaged 8.5 convictions in the period between 1981 and 1986. Eighty-seven percent of those with a Fine Default suspension and 88 percent of those with an Other suspension had one or more convictions prior to their 1986 suspension. Members of the Fine Default suspension group averaged 4.2 convictions, while members of the Other suspension group averaged 5.7 convictions.

Drivers receiving a Probationary Demerit or Criminal Code suspension were somewhat less likely to have received a previous conviction (83% and 80%, respectively, received a conviction between 1981 and 1986). On average, each member of the Probationary Demerit suspension group received 2.4 convictions and each member of the Criminal Code group received 2.9 convictions.

Individuals with a Medical suspension are the least likely to have had a conviction over the previous five years (59% had no convictions, 41% had one or more convictions). On average, each member of this suspension group only had 1.1 convictions.

TABLE 9
1981-1986 DRIVING RECORD
(Vertical Percentages Based on 4,616 Driver Records)

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
<u>Previous Suspensions</u>							
1 or more	49	44	49	25	47	58	54
Criminal Code	17	29	9	5	30	15	17
Demerit	6	4	18	-	-	8	12
Probationary							
Demerit	7	5	2	15	2	8	12
Medical	1	1	-	-	17	1	1
Fine Default	30	17	32	10	11	44	31
Driving While							
Suspended	6	4	5	4	6	8	6
Other suspensions	2	2	6	-	1	3	11

* Drivers may have had more than one suspension

<u>Previous Collisions</u>							
1 or more	49	49	69	56	37	46	60
<u>Previous Convictions</u>							
No convictions	16	20	-	17	59	13	12
1-2 convictions	31	36	1	50	25	27	15
3-5 convictions	29	30	24	22	12	31	27
6 or more							
convicitons	24	15	75	10	3	29	45
Average	3.7	2.9	8.5	2.4	1.1	4.2	5.7

6.0 1986 DRIVER'S LICENSE SUSPENSION

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Information about the 1986 license suspension derived from the Driver Records database included:

- 1) length of suspension;
- 2) any traffic offence convictions during the 1986 suspension period;
- 3) any vehicle collisions during the suspension period; and,
- 4) any additional suspensions beginning during the suspension period.

The line of questioning used in the telephone survey was designed specifically to help the respondent to recall and reconstruct the period of time in 1986 when his/her driver's license was suspended. As part of the interview, survey respondents were reminded of the month in which the suspension started.

Subsequently, they were asked questions concerning:

- 1) notification of suspension;
- 2) consequences of the license suspension; and,
- 3) whether or not they drove during the time their licenses were suspended.

6.2 LENGTH OF SUSPENSION

On average, individuals who had their licenses suspended in 1986 received suspensions of 6.1 months' duration. Eighty-two percent received suspensions of up to one year, seven percent between one and two years and two percent greater than two years. Ten percent of 1986 suspended drivers received a suspension with an indefinite end date.

Drivers with a Criminal Code suspension received the longest suspension (13.7-month suspension, on average; 21% longer than one year). Medical and Other suspensions lasted, on average, 5.7 and 5.2 months. Shorter suspensions were given to the Fine Default group (3.7 months, on average; 67% less than six months), the Demerit group (2.2 months; 91% less than six months) and the Probationary Demerit group (1.6 months, 93% less than six months).

TABLE 10
LENGTH OF 1986 SUSPENSION
(Vertical Percentage Based on 4,616 Driver Records)

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
Length of Suspension							
Less than 6 months	59	20	91	93	31	67	63
6-12 months	23	57	6	2	11	14	9
13-24 months	7	15	2	1	7	6	3
25 + months	2	6	-	-	-	-	4
Indefinite	10	2	-	3	51	12	21
Average	6.1	13.7	2.2	6	5.7	3.7	5.2

6.3 LEARNING ABOUT THEIR SUSPENSION

The majority of suspended drivers (52%) found out that their licenses were suspended prior to or at the beginning of their suspension period. Forty-three percent of respondents received notification of their suspension after the start of their suspension, while three percent report not finding out until after their suspension had ended and they had been reinstated. Only two percent of respondents were unable to recall the circumstances surrounding their license suspension.

There is a great deal of variation in notification of suspension, depending on the type of suspension incurred. Eighty-three percent of those receiving a Criminal Code suspension were notified prior to or at the beginning of their suspension. This is because the judge informs the driver of the suspension at the time of sentencing. In contrast, 48 percent of those receiving an Other suspension and only 28 percent of those receiving a Fine Default suspension knew about their suspension prior to its start date. In many instances, a "paper trigger" (unpaid fine, accumulation of demerit points, etc.) starts the suspension and notification is the only contact made with the driver.

There is also some variation in time of notification by region of residence. Residents of Central Ontario, particularly individuals living in Metro Toronto, were less likely to have found out about their suspension before it actually started.

Slightly less than one-half of respondents (44%) were notified by letter delivered by registered mail. Another 24 percent were told in court or through a judge's court order; 17 percent were informed by the police and five percent found out because they were unable to renew their licenses. Less than 10 percent were notified by other means.

Eighty-one percent of individuals with a Criminal Code suspension first learned about their suspension by court order. The remaining five suspension groups principally found out about their 1986 suspension by letter. A substantial minority of respondents (25%) with a Fine Default suspension, however, learned about their suspension after being stopped by the police while driving after their suspension had already begun.

TABLE 11
LEARNING ABOUT 1986 SUSPENSION
(Vertical Percentages Based on 1,510 Interviews)

	<u>All Drivers N=1,510</u>	<u>Criminal Code N=317</u>	<u>Demerit N=152</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit N=245</u>	<u>Medical N=150</u>	<u>Fine Default N=506</u>	<u>Other N=141</u>
<u>When first learned about suspension</u>							
Beginning	52	83	65	72	60	28	48
After suspension started	43	16	31	25	31	63	45
Not until end	3	-	1	1	2	6	3
Cannot recall	2	-	3	1	7	3	4
<u>Method of Notification</u>							
Letter	44	9	74	82	57	47	56
Court/judge	24	81	4	4	14	6	11
Police	17	8	11	8	11	25	10
Unable to renew	5	-	3	-	4	9	2
Survey	1	-	-	-	-	1	1
Other	7	1	6	4	13	8	14
Cannot recall	1	-	2	-	-	1	4

6.4 DIFFICULTIES CREATED BY 1986 LICENSE SUSPENSION

6.4.1 Major Disruptions

Twenty-six percent of respondents report having had to cope with a major disruption in their work situation - from having to change their work responsibilities to losing their jobs - because of their license suspension.

Again, there are substantial differences by suspension groups regarding the types of problems encountered as a result of their 1986 suspension. Among the three groups indicating the importance of driving as part of their work, low to moderate percentages of two groups and a fairly high percentage of the third group report major work disruptions. Forty-five percent of those with an Other

suspension either lost their jobs or were forced to change their work responsibilities. In contrast, 34 percent of respondents with a Demerit suspension and only 17 percent of those with a Fine Default suspension had to change their work situation or responsibilities due to their suspension.

Five percent of the sample of suspended drivers indicate that they were forced to leave school or miss classes due to their 1986 license suspension. No more than seven percent of any suspension group had to leave school or miss classes.

6.4.2 Difficulties in Undertaking Daily Activities

The majority of suspended drivers encountered at least some difficulty in carrying out their day-to-day non-work activities because of their license suspension. The activities that suspended drivers found most difficult to accomplish were everyday activities such as shopping or attending to personal business (41% very difficult, 25% somewhat difficult). One-third of respondents found that it was very difficult to participate in their regular leisure and recreational activities or to meet their social obligations. Twenty-two percent found that their families had a great deal of difficulty getting around as a result of their license suspension.

Overall, drivers who had received either a Criminal Code or Other suspension faced greater difficulties in accomplishing their daily activities. A middle group consisting of Demerit, Probationary Demerit and Medical suspensions encountered an average level of difficulty. Individuals who had received a Fine Default suspension faced fewer difficulties than other suspended drivers in carrying out day-to-day tasks.

TABLE 12
CONSEQUENCES OF LICENCE SUSPENSION
(Individual Items Based on 1,510 Interviews)

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
Lose job, change work	26	37	34	25	21	17	46
Leave school, miss classes	4	7	7	5	3	3	5
<u>Very difficult to...</u>							
Shop, personal business	41	51	52	40	45	35	50
Leisure, recreation	37	47	43	39	41	31	42
Social obligations	34	41	38	36	37	29	36
Family getting around	22	31	20	17	23	17	31

6.5 ESTIMATES OF THE PERCENTAGE WHO DROVE WHILE SUSPENDED

6.5.1 Driver Record Evidence of Driving While Under Suspension

One of the major goals of this study is to estimate the percentage of suspended drivers who had driven a vehicle during the period of their suspension. The lower level or floor estimate of this percentage is derived from the analysis of Driver Records.

6.5.2 Convictions During Suspension

Eleven percent of suspended drivers received at least one conviction during the time that their driver's licenses had been suspended. This means that a minimum of one in ten suspended drivers had contact with the police while driving during their suspension period.

Nevertheless, only three percent of suspended drivers were convicted for the offense of driving while suspended. Nine percent received a Highway Traffic Act conviction and one percent were given a Criminal Code conviction.

Although it might be expected that every suspended driver who has contact with the police should be charged with driving while suspended, suspended drivers who are unaware of their suspension initially are given formal notice on site by the police.

6.5.3 Collisions During Suspension

A very low percentage of suspended drivers (2%) have been involved in a collision during their suspension. Three percent of drivers receiving a Fine Default or Other suspension, one percent of those receiving a Criminal Code or Demerit suspension and less than one percent receiving a Probationary Demerit or Medical suspension have had contact with the police during their suspension because they were in an accident.

6.5.4 Suspensions During Suspension

Suspensions arising during the 1986 suspension period may have resulted from convictions occurring before or after the start of the 1986 suspension. The occurrence of additional suspensions may be due to the length of the original suspension, the nature of conviction leading to the additional suspension or the administrative time required to process convictions.

Four percent of suspended drivers received one or more additional suspensions during their 1986 suspension. The percentage receiving additional suspensions is highest among Criminal Code and Other suspensions (7%) and lowest among Demerit and Probationary Demerit suspensions (2%).

TABLE 13
1986 SUSPENSION CHARACTERISTICS
(Vertical Percentages Based on 4,616 Driver Records)

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
<u>Convictions during Suspension</u>							
1 or more	11	5	9	5	3	17	11
H.T.A.	9	2	7	4	2	14	8
Criminal Code	1	2	1	-	1	1	1
Driving While Suspended	3	2	2	1	1	4	3

(Drivers may have had more than one suspension.)

<u>Collisions During Suspension</u>							
1 or more	2	1	1	-	-	3	3
<u>Suspensions During Suspension</u>							
1 or more	4	7	2	2	4	4	7

6.5.5 Self-Reports of Driving While Under Suspension

The analysis of the driver records indicates that 11 percent of suspended drivers were convicted of a driving-related offence during their 1986 suspension. This includes the two percent of suspended drivers that were involved in a collision leading to a conviction.

The alternative method of determining the proportion of suspended drivers who violated their suspension is to ask suspended drivers directly whether or not they had driven. This questioning was conducted during the interview phase of this study. In order to minimize under-reporting of illegal behaviour, the questions regarding driving while suspended were strategically located in the body of the interview. By this time, the interviewer had established a rapport with the respondent because the respondent understood the importance of the study and was assured his or her answers were strictly confidential.

The interview phase of this study has allowed the categorization of suspended drivers into three groups based on driving during their 1986 suspension. The three groups are:

- 1) Suspended drivers who knowingly violated their suspension or were caught driving by the police during their 1986 suspension. This group accounts for 34 percent of the sample.
- 2) Suspended drivers who drove during their 1986 suspension, but were unaware that their license had been suspended because they had not been notified, but once notified, had stopped driving. This group accounts for an additional 23 percent of the sample.
- 3) Suspended drivers who reported not driving at all during their suspension. This group accounts for 41 percent of the study sample.

The remaining two percent of the sample were unable to answer whether or not they had driven during this period of time; therefore, they could not be classified.

TABLE 14
PERCENTAGES DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED
(Vertical Percentages Based on 1,510 Interviews)

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
Drove and Aware of Suspension	34	29	42	22	20	41	34
Drove but unaware of suspension	23	6	13	18	10	35	28
Did not drive	41	65	44	60	67	21	37

6.6 PEOPLE WHO ADMIT DRIVING OR WERE CAUGHT BY THE POLICE

6.6.1 Incidence by Suspension Group

In total, 34 percent of suspended drivers who were interviewed admit driving during their 1986 suspension or were caught driving by the police. Only two percent had to be reminded that they had contact with the police: the remaining 32 percent admitted freely that they had driven while suspended.

Slightly more than four of ten respondents with either a Demerit (42%) or a Fine Default (41%) suspension admit driving while suspended. About one-third of individuals with an Other suspension drove, 29 percent of those with a Criminal Code suspension, 22 percent of individuals with a Probationary Demerit suspension and 20 percent of those with a Medical suspension.

6.6.2 Demographic Profile

The following demographic description of those who knowingly drove a vehicle while their licenses were suspended focuses on the deviations from the general demographic profile presented in Section 1.0.

One-third of those who knowingly broke their suspension live in Central Ontario and an additional 23 percent reside in Metro Toronto. Compared to the overall distribution of suspended drivers, these two regions are slightly overrepresented. As well, there is an over-representation among those living in the largest communities of Ontario.

The distinguishing demographic features of those who ignored their suspension are their socio-economic characteristics. Suspended drivers who drove during their suspension tend to be better educated, to earn higher incomes or to work in the skilled trades.

6.6.3 Driving History and Characteristics

The driving history of suspended drivers, taken from their Driver Records, offers several clues as to who purposely violated their license suspension. First, suspended drivers who had been licensed for more than three years (at the time of their 1986 suspension) are over-represented among individuals who disregarded their suspension. Second, it is likely that the individual had been suspended previously. Third, respondents who had received a greater number of convictions than the median for their suspension group were more likely to have driven, particularly if they had had a Fine Default or Other suspension.

Drivers who knowingly drove during their 1986 suspension at present are driving more frequently and travelling longer-than-average distances per week. Furthermore, they are over-represented among those who drive as part of their job. Finally, those who did not comply with their suspension are more likely to be living in households with other licensed drivers.

6.7 PEOPLE WHO STOPPED DRIVING WHEN THEY FOUND OUT ABOUT THEIR SUSPENSION

6.7.1 Incidence by Suspension Group

Twenty-three percent of suspended drivers who participated in the interview indicated that they were driving prior to being notified about their suspension, but discontinued driving once they received notification. All these individuals report having received notification of their suspension after the start day. Although members of this subgroup of suspended drivers drove during their suspension period, they did so unknowingly.

More than one-third of respondents who received a Fine Default suspension in 1986 drove a vehicle because they were unaware that their license had been suspended. This percentage is 12 points above the norm for all suspended drivers. Twenty-eight percent of respondents with a 1986 Other suspension and 18 percent of those with a Probationary Demerit suspension drove while their license was suspended. Less than 15 percent of the remaining three suspension groups drove during their suspension, but stopped driving upon receiving notification.

6.7.2 Demographic Profile

Respondents who drove while suspended but were unaware of their suspension share a relatively similar demographic profile with those who knowingly drove. There is a higher representation in Metro Toronto of both types of drivers. In particular, there is an over-representation of individuals with a post-secondary education, particularly those who have attended university and those who earn more than \$50,000 among both groups.

Two differences stand out, however. First, there is a higher percentage of individuals working in professional and managerial positions who stopped driving. Second, individuals in the 25-to-34 age group were more likely to continue driving, while married, older individuals tended to stop driving.

6.7.3 Driving History and Characteristics

The driving history of those who say they ceased to drive after receiving notification of their suspension is somewhat different than those who knowingly drove. Individuals who had received previously the same type of suspension as their 1986 suspension were the most likely to have stopped driving. There is also a tendency among those with a Fine Default suspension, with fewer convictions than the median for their group, to have stopped driving. There is, however, a similarity between the two groups who drove during their suspension in that there is an over-representation among those who had been driving three to seven years at the time of their 1986 suspension.

The current driving habits of individuals who drove while suspended but were unaware of their suspension are: 1) driving frequently; 2) driving higher than average "kilometrage" per week; and, 3) driving as part of their work. There is a tendency for those who stopped driving to live currently in households with one other licensed driver.

6.8 PEOPLE WHO DID NOT DRIVE

6.8.1 Incidence by Suspension Group

Forty-one percent of respondents report that they did not drive at all during their 1986 suspension period. The highest levels of compliance to their suspensions are found among individuals receiving a Medical suspension (67% of this suspension group did not drive), a Criminal Code suspension (65% did not drive) or a Probationary Demerit suspension (60% did not drive). Lower levels of compliance are found among Fine Default suspensions (21% did not drive), Other suspensions (37%) and Demerit suspensions (44%).

6.8.2 Demographic Profile

The demographic profile of those who obeyed their suspension is basically the reverse image of those who drove. There is an over-representation of individuals who did not drive among suspended drivers living in the north and western parts of Ontario, as well as those living in small- and medium-size communities. Furthermore, compliance to their 1986 suspension was more likely among older individuals, especially those who were not participating in the labour force.

Finally, there are greater percentages of respondents who did not drive among those with less education, unskilled workers and labourers and less affluent individuals.

6.8.3 Driving History and Characteristics

The Driver Record data indicates that those who complied with their 1986 suspension did not have a previous suspension history. Respondents with fewer than the median number of convictions for their 1986 suspension group were less likely to have driven (Probationary Demerit, Medical and Criminal Code suspension groups). As well, those who had less driving experience at the time of their suspension were likely to have complied with their suspension.

The current driving habits of suspended drivers who did not drive demonstrate less reliance on operating a vehicle (less frequent travel, lower "kilometrage" per week and less work-related travel). Interestingly, they are slightly more likely to comply with the suspension even when there are no other licensed drivers in their households.

TABLE 15
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES OF GROUPS DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED
(Vertical Percentages Based on 1,510 Interviews)

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Knowingly Drove</u>	<u>Drove But Unaware</u>	<u>Did Not Drive</u>
<u>Region</u>				
Eastern	13	13	14	14
Central	29	32	32	29
Metro	21	23	25	16
Western	23	22	20	28
Northern	10	9	8	12
<u>Community Size</u>				
Less than 10K	22	23	18	24
10K to 100K	23	20	21	27
100K to 500K	26	27	30	25
500K +	25	28	28	21
<u>Age</u>				
16-24 years	29	30	25	31
25-34 years	43	49	44	36
35 + years	29	21	32	34
<u>Work Status</u>				
Full-time	77	80	84	72
Part-time	7	8	7	7
Not working	15	13	10	20
<u>Occupation</u>				
Professional	14	15	21	8
Sales, Clerical	18	19	20	16
Skilled, Semi	22	26	19	21
Unskilled	29	26	29	32
<u>Education</u>				
Less than H.S.	32	30	27	35
High School	29	27	28	33
Community College	23	25	25	20
University	16	18	21	11
<u>Income</u>				
Less than \$20K	17	12	16	23
\$20K to \$30K	19	21	21	18
\$30K to \$50K	29	32	27	29
\$50K +	27	32	32	21
<u>Marital Status</u>				
Single	44	46	38	45
Married	44	43	52	42
Wid/Sep/Div	11	11	11	12

TABLE 16
DRIVING HISTORY OF GROUPS DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED
(Vertical Percentages Based on 4,616 Driver Records)

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Knowingly Drove</u>	<u>Drove But Unaware</u>	<u>Did Not Drive</u>
<u>Years Licensed</u>				
1-4 years	18	12	17	24
5-9 years	32	38	38	23
10+ years	42	45	40	39
<u>Previous Suspensions</u>				
None	52	44	51	58
Same suspension	32	37	39	23
Different suspension	16	19	11	11
<u>Previous Convictions above Median</u>				
Criminal Code	11	10	4	17
Demerit	2	2	1	1
Probationary Demerit	7	6	6	8
Medical	1	1	-	2
Fine Default	23	30	34	12
Other	3	6	2	3
<u>Previous Convictions below Median</u>				
Criminal Code	13	11	2	22
Demerit	2	2	2	2
Probationary Demerit	8	3	5	13
Medical	2	1	1	3
Fine Default	26	29	40	14
Other	3	2	4	2

TABLE 17
CURRENT DRIVING PATTERNS OF GROUPS DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED
(Vertical Percentages Based on 1,510 Interviews)

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Knowingly Drove</u>	<u>Drove But Unaware</u>	<u>Did Not Drive</u>
<u>Driving Frequency</u>				
Daily	79	83	86	73
Less often	13	9	14	14
<u>Distance per Week</u>				
Less than 100 KM	31	24	28	37
100 to 500 KM	36	41	41	31
500 + KM	24	27	29	19
<u>Trip Purpose</u>				
Commute	46	45	48	46
Drive as job	25	30	32	18
Other	20	18	18	23
<u>Other Household Drivers</u>				
None	21	18	19	24
One	44	44	50	42
Two or more	35	38	32	33

7.0 DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Suspended drivers who admitted driving during their 1986 suspension were asked a series of questions regarding when they started driving after learning about their suspension, the circumstances and reasons for driving, changes in their driving habits and patterns, use of alternative means of transportation and contact with the police. In total, 481 individuals (weighted N=495) answered this series of questions about driving while suspended.

7.2 WHEN THEY STARTED DRIVING

7.2.1 Time and Circumstances

There is a basic split among respondents according to when they started driving after learning that their licenses had been suspended. One-half of this group of suspended drivers drove immediately after their suspension, while the other one-half waited from several days to several months to start driving again. About one-quarter of all suspended drivers who knowingly drove waited at least one month before getting behind the wheel of a vehicle.

Suspended drivers with either a Fine Default or Other suspension were the least hesitant to continue driving (66% of Fine Defaults and 62% of Others drove immediately after learning about their suspension). Probationary Demerit suspended drivers tended to delay somewhat their return to driving, while Criminal Code and Medical suspensions hesitated the longest time.

Respondents who knowingly drove when their licenses had been suspended cite a variety of circumstances that led to driving. Eleven percent of respondents indicate that they never stopped driving; that is, being under suspension had no bearing on their decision to drive. Five percent drove their car home after learning about their suspension and nine percent drove to the Ministry to deal with matters surrounding their suspension. The single most frequently cited circumstance associated with driving while suspended was work- or school-related travel (32% of suspended drivers) followed by social, personal or recreational travel (14%). Six percent report that they started driving because of a medical emergency.

7.2.2 Differences by Suspension Group

Each suspension group gives a different combination of circumstances that led to driving while suspended.

Respondents who had received a Demerit suspension are most likely to have started driving principally because of work- or school-related activities. Those with a Fine Default suspension indicate work or school reasons, as well as the fact they never actually stopped driving. Probationary Demerit suspensions indicate work or school and

social or recreational travel, while those with a Criminal Code suspension add medical circumstances to the previous two reasons. Respondents who had received an Other suspension combine work/school with shopping.

TABLE 18
THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED
(Vertical Percentages Based on 495 Interviews)

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
<u>When Started Driving</u>							
Immediately	50	21	35	22	16	66	62
Several days	7	8	14	7	6	2	
Week	9	3	11	23	-	9	17
Several weeks	9	5	24	29	15	6	9
One month or more	24	64	20	12	59	12	11
<u>Circumstances</u>							
Work/school travel	32	31	53	32	24	32	27
Social, personal, recreation	14	20	14	23	17	11	9
Never stopped driving	11	3	6	2	6	15	12
Drove to Ministry	9	-	-	3	-	14	10
Medical	6	15	5	7	32	2	2
Drove home	5	5	5	3	-	6	6
No other transportation	5	3	8	9	-	5	-
Shopping	4	7	3	6	5	2	19
Others	4	5	5	4	-	3	3

7.3 FREQUENCY OF DRIVING

Forty-one percent of individuals who knowingly drove while suspended did so on a daily basis. A substantial percentage of suspended drivers drove infrequently during their suspension (22% drove 2 or 3 times and 15% drove only once).

Over one-half of drivers with a Fine Default suspension and more than four of ten drivers with an Other suspension continued to drive on a frequent basis. Drivers from the remaining four suspension groups drove less frequently - approximately 50 percent drove up to a maximum of three times during the time their licences were suspended. For all six suspension groups, the reported frequency of driving during their suspension was substantially less than their current rate of driving.

TABLE 19
FREQUENCY OF DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED
(Vertical Percentages Based on 495 Interviews)

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Fine Medical</u>	<u>Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
Daily	41	17	27	20	6	55	43
Weekly	15	12	16	18	32	16	4
2-3 times/month	6	11	10	6	15	3	9
2-3 times	22	34	29	34	26	16	27
Once	15	26	20	19	21	9	18

7.4 REASONS FOR DRIVING

The usual or most frequent reasons given by respondents for travelling during their suspension period are comparable to the information about the circumstances in which a person first started to drive. Forty-five percent of respondents who knowingly drove while suspended were principally commuting between home and work, while an additional 22 percent continued driving as part of their job. Fourteen percent were driving to go shopping or to attend to personal business, 11 percent to drive to social or recreational activities, five percent to deal with an emergency situation and two percent to attend school or classes. Those who drove because of an emergency usually describe the emergency as medically-related.

As the previous analysis of circumstances for initially driving have shown, individuals with a Demerit suspension were travelling for work-related reasons. Respondents with a Fine Default suspension who had indicated earlier that they never stopped driving were commuting or driving largely as part of their work.

TABLE 20
REASONS FOR DRIVING
(Respondents Driving More Than Once, N=495)

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
Commuting	45	32	48	31	20	52	35
Drive as job	22	20	16	14	6	24	26
Shopping, personal	14	16	8	22	30	12	23
Emergency	5	11	9	6	20	3	6
School, classes	2	-	3	7	-	2	2

7.5 CHANGE IN DRIVING HABITS

7.5.1 Driving Patterns

Among suspended drivers who drove more than once during their suspension period, two-thirds report that they drove less frequently than under normal circumstances. An additional 29 percent indicate that they did not change the frequency of driving, while one percent report actually having driven more frequently during the time of their suspension.

Changes in driving habits during the respondent's 1986 suspension are related to current driving patterns. Individuals who at present drive on a daily basis or who drive a high "kilometrage" per week were more likely to have maintained their usual driving patterns during their 1986 suspension.

Slightly more than 60 percent say they drove more cautiously because of their suspension, while about one-half report driving more slowly than usual. Fewer than one-third of suspended drivers who drove more than once during their suspension report other changes in driving behaviour (29% used roads on which there were fewer police, 23% used roads with less traffic and 21% changed their normal travel routes). Only 12 percent decided to change the times of the day at which they normally travelled.

7.5.2 Changes by Suspension Group

The survey findings indicate significant differences in the way members of the six suspension groups adjusted their normal driving habits. In general, individuals receiving a Probationary Demerit or Demerit Suspension were the most likely to have changed some aspect of their driving habits, while those with either a Fine Default or Other suspension were the most likely to have continued driving in their usual manner.

Respondents who had received a Probationary Demerit suspension drove less frequently (90%), drove more cautiously (81%), drove more slowly (63%), sought out routes with fewer police (35%) and changed their normal travel routes (29%). Respondents who had received a Demerit suspension drove less often (84%), drove more cautiously (76%), drove more slowly (60%) and used roads with fewer police (32%).

Individuals who had received a Medical suspension responded in a manner similar to those with a Probationary Demerit. Respondents with a Medical suspension, however, were more likely to select routes with fewer police and to use less travelled roads.

Those who had received a Criminal Code suspension, but continued to drive, drove less frequently (93%). Furthermore, a relatively high percentage drove with more caution than usual (65%).

Forty percent of those with a Fine Default suspension and 28 percent with an Other suspension admit making no changes in the frequency of their driving. Nevertheless, some respondents with a Fine Default suspension indicate that they drove more cautiously (58%) and slowly (49%) and some individuals with an Other suspension drove more cautiously (48%). The percentages of those with either a Fine Default or Other suspension who altered their driving habits are generally lower than for other suspension groups.

TABLE 21
CHANGE IN DRIVING HABITS
(Respondents Driving More Than Once, N=495)

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
<u>Frequency</u>							
Less often	69	93	84	90	86	59	68
Same	29	4	15	10	5	40	28
More often	1	3	2	-	9	1	4
<u>Changes in Driving (% Responding "Yes" to Each Item)</u>							
Drive more cautiously	62	65	76	81	68	58	48
Drive more slowly	47	40	60	63	39	49	32
Use roads with fewer police	29	28	32	35	38	28	24
Use roads with less traffic	23	24	20	30	37	21	16
Change route	21	22	21	29	27	20	14
Change time of day	12	13	13	11	16	11	16

7.6 REASONS FOR CHANGING DRIVING HABITS

7.6.1 The Motivational Factors

The three most important reasons given by suspended drivers who drove while suspended, but changed their driving habits are: 1) the threat of additional penalties (70% very important); 2) the potential of making contact with the police (67% very important); and, 3) concern over being involved in an accident (60% very important). Less salient reasons for altering their driving patterns include the realization that they were breaking the law by driving during their suspension (45% very important) or having family and friends telling them to change their driving habits (15% very important).

7.6.2 Differences by Suspension Group

Individuals who had received a Probationary Demerit or Demerit suspension were the most likely to have altered their normal driving patterns. Nevertheless, Probationary Demerit suspended drivers are no more highly motivated by the previously mentioned deterrents than the average suspended driver.

Respondents with a Demerit suspension, however, took into consideration the potential for receiving additional penalties (76% very important) and contact with the police (74% very important) in deciding to alter their driving habits.

Of all six suspension groups, those with a Criminal Code suspension were the most influenced by the threat of additional penalties (84% indicate that additional penalties were very important in changing their driving habits). It should be noted that according to the Driver Record analysis, individuals with a Criminal Code suspension already were receiving the longest suspensions (13.7 months, on average). As well, respondents with a Criminal Code suspension are influenced, to a great extent, by potential contact with the police (73% very important), by concerns about being involved in an accident (63% very important) and by the knowledge that they were breaking the law (61% very important).

The leading factor among respondents with either a Medical or Other suspension in changing their driving habits during their suspension was concern about being involved in an accident. Eight-three percent of those with Medical suspensions and 77 percent of those with Other suspensions indicate that they altered their driving patterns because they were concerned about being involved in an accident.

Respondents with a Fine Default suspension were not only more likely than others to continue driving without changing their driving patterns, but also were somewhat less likely to be influenced by potential deterrents. While 66 percent of those who changed their driving habits were very concerned about additional penalties, 64 percent were very concerned about contact with the police and only 60 percent were very concerned about being involved in an accident. These levels of concern are average or below the average for all suspended drivers who drove.

TABLE 22
REASONS FOR CHANGING DRIVING PATTERNS
(Respondents Who Changed Driving Habits, N=365)

	<u>All</u> <u>Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal</u> <u>Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u> <u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary</u> <u>Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine</u> <u>Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
<u>Very Important</u> (% Responding "Very Important" to Each Item)							
Additional penalties	70	84	76	63	62	66	72
Contact with Police	67	73	74	67	73	64	66
Concern about accidents	60	63	55	44	83	60	77
Breaking the law	45	61	42	33	63	40	42
Influence of others	15	18	18	4	13	15	21

7.7 ALTERNATIVES TO DRIVING

The most common alternative to driving used by suspended drivers who drove during their suspension was obtaining rides from family or friends (67%). About one-half of suspended drivers (48%) either walked or rode a bike more often, 35 percent took a taxi more frequently and 31 percent resorted to using public transit.

The relative degree of reliance on the four alternative means of transportation - rides, walking or biking, taxis and public transit - is repeated in each of four suspension groups. Respondents with a Criminal Code suspension were the most likely to have used each of the four alternatives, while those with a Fine Default suspension are the least likely. Those with Other and Demerit suspensions fall between those with Criminal Code and Fine Default suspensions.

The two remaining suspension groups - Probationary Demerit and Medical - frequently received rides or walked, but were somewhat more likely to have taken public transit than to have taken taxis. The higher costs of taking taxis versus using public transit may have influenced the decisions of those with Probationary Demerit or Medical suspensions.

TABLE 23
ALTERNATIVES TO DRIVING

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
<u>% Responding "Yes" to Each Item</u>							
Rides from family, friends	67	93	84	83	88	53	66
Walk or ride a bike	48	70	54	62	68	37	47
Take taxi	35	54	26	26	26	29	40
Take public transit	31	48	29	35	46	24	30

7.8 CONTACT WITH THE POLICE

7.8.1 The Situations

Overall, 19 percent of those who knowingly drove while their licences were suspended had contact with the police either through the R.I.D.E. program or spot checks (9%), a traffic violation (8%) or an accident or collision (4%). Fewer than one percent of suspended drivers had contact with the police because of a mechanical breakdown of their vehicle. Some suspended drivers had more than one contact with the police.

Compared to all other suspension groups, individuals with a Medical suspension were the most likely to have come into contact with the police (26%). Sixteen percent of those who drove during their Medical suspension were stopped by R.I.D.E. or police spot checks. This may, in part, be explained by the fact that Medical suspensions are relatively long in duration (5.7 months, on average), thereby increasing the opportunity to be stopped by roadside police checks.

Approximately two in ten individuals who drove with either a Demerit suspension (21%), a Fine Default suspension (20%), a Criminal Code suspension (19%) or an Other suspension (18%) had contact with the police. Probationary Demerit suspended drivers had the lowest rate of police contact (11%). It is interesting to note that those with a Demerit suspension had above-average rates of encountering a police spot check (14%) and being stopped for a traffic violation (15%).

Two types of police contact - traffic violations and collisions - can be regarded as indicators of how cautiously or carefully suspended drivers were driving. Conditions and factors affecting violations and collisions also would include length of suspension and frequency of travel.

Since the smallest percentage of Probationary Demerit drivers were involved in either a traffic violation or collision, it might be interpreted that these individuals were exercising the greatest degree of care when driving. Individuals with a Criminal Code or Medical suspension would be considered somewhat less cautious, but still more cautious than the remaining three suspension groups.

The relatively high rates at which individuals with a Demerit or Other suspension received traffic violations might be indicating that their driving habits had remained unaltered to a great extent by their suspensions.

7.8.2 The Consequences

As a result of contact with the police, 64 percent of these suspended drivers report having their licenses checked by the police to see if they were under suspensions. Of these individuals, three-quarters were charged with driving while suspended, 12 percent received a suspension notice, four percent were given a verbal warning and eight percent were allowed to continue without being given a verbal warning. These percentages should be interpreted with a high degree of caution because of the small numbers of respondents involved.

TABLE 24
CONTACT WITH POLICE DURING SUSPENSION
(N=495)

	<u>All</u> <u>Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal</u> <u>Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary</u> <u>Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine</u> <u>Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
<u>Contact with Police</u>	19	19	21	11	26	20	18
R.I.D.E. or spot							
checks	9	9	14	6	16	10	7
Traffic violation	8	5	15	2	4	9	12
Accident or collision	4	5	2	2	6	4	-
Mechanical breakdown	-	1	-	-	-	1	-
<u>Check Licence (N=93)</u>	64	66	63	60	68	63	77
<u>Subsequent Police Action (N=60)</u>							
Lay charge	74						
Suspension notice	12						
Verbal warning	4						
Do nothing	8						

8.0 NOT DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED

8.1 INTRODUCTION

Sixty-four percent of survey respondents either did not drive at all during their 1986 suspension (41%) or ceased driving once they received notification that their licence was suspended (23%). The latter group of individuals report not receiving their suspension notice until after their suspension had already started.

These respondents were asked a separate set of questions dealing with 1) alternative means of transportation used; and, 2) the underlying motivating forces that stopped them from getting behind the wheel of a vehicle.

8.2 USE OF ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION

Suspended drivers who did not knowingly drive during their 1986 suspension period coped with the situation principally by getting rides from family or friends (86%) or simply travelling less (70%). Other methods of dealing with not being able to drive include walking or biking (61%), using public transit more often (48%) and taking a taxi more frequently (44%).

Those who drove a vehicle (either knowingly or unknowingly) and those who did not drive at all responded in roughly the same manner, but, as one would expect, with varying degrees of conviction. That is, all suspended drivers relied heavily on their family and social networks for providing rides. As well, they simply travelled less frequently. Comparisons across the three groups of suspended drivers, however, reveal that those who did not drive were the most likely to have used other transportation; those who stopped driving part way through their suspension were somewhat more likely to have used alternative transportation and those who drove throughout their suspension were the least likely to resort to other means of travel.

Respondents with a Fine Default suspension - whether they drove or not - were the least likely to have needed alternative transportation. This is explained, in part, by the fact that their suspensions lasted for a shorter period of time.

TABLE 25
ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION
USED BY THOSE WHO DID NOT DRIVE

SUSPENSION GROUP

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
Rides from family, friends	86	90	90	93	89	79	88
Travel less	70	77	69	79	84	58	80
Walk or bike	61	74	65	74	71	47	54
Public Transit more	48	48	39	55	63	43	47
Use taxi more	44	56	43	40	46	38	47

DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED

	<u>Knowingly Drove</u>	<u>Drove but not Knowingly</u>	<u>Did not Drive</u>
Rides from family, friends	67	81	89
Travel less	69	59	76
Walk or bike	48	51	67
Public transit more	35	44	50
Use taxi more	31	39	48

8.3 REASONS FOR NOT DRIVING

Two reasons for not driving are cited by at least seven of ten respondents who did not drive or stopped driving upon receiving notice of their suspension. The most important motivational factor for preventing people from driving is the threat of receiving additional penalties (74% of those who stopped driving and 77% of those who never drove indicate this as very important). As well, 70 percent of those who stopped driving and 75 percent of those who did not drive at all report that it was very important to abide by the law.

Apprehension about being caught by the police was an important deterrent to a significant percentage of those who stopped driving (64% very important) and those who did not drive (73% very important). The fear of being involved in an accident was very important to 63 percent of those who stopped driving and 60 percent who did not drive.

Other factors related to ceasing or not driving include the belief that the suspension was appropriate punishment (35% very important those who stopped driving, 47% those who did not drive), the influence of family and friends (30% very important those who stopped driving, 36% those who did not drive) and the knowledge that it is possible to get caught driving while suspended (32% very important those who stopped, 34% those who did not drive).

The threat of receiving additional penalties, the acknowledgement that driving while suspended is breaking the law and the fear of being caught by the police are important motivational factors among five of the six suspension groups. The influence of these deterrents, however, is significantly lower among individuals with a Medical suspension. This may be explained by the fact that a Medical suspension is not viewed in the same punitive manner as other types of suspensions.

TABLE 27
MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS RELATED
TO NOT DRIVING

SUSPENSION GROUP

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
<u>Very Important</u>							
Additional penalties	76	80	81	74	56	75	78
Breaking the law	73	75	72	68	67	74	81
Contact with police	69	75	75	67	49	68	73
Involvement in accident	61	57	49	54	52	67	70
Appropriate punishment	43	57	44	38	41	36	43
Influence of family, friends	33	39	28	36	37	28	39
Knowing others who were caught	33	36	20	31	31	32	30

TABLE 28
MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS RELATED TO NOT DRIVING
AMONG THOSE WHO DID NOT DRIVE OR STOPPED UPON NOTIFICATION

	<u>Drove but not Knowingly</u>	<u>Did not Drive</u>
Additional penalties	74	77
Breaking the law	70	75
Contact with police	64	73
Involvement in accident	63	60
Appropriate punishment	35	47
Influence of family, friend	30	36
Knowing drivers who were caught	32	34

9.0 THE ATTITUDES OF SUSPENDED DRIVERS

9.1 INTRODUCTION

All survey respondents -- whether or not they drove during their 1986 suspension -- were asked a series of questions to determine their attitudes toward driving while suspended. These questions were designed to gain an understanding of the attitudes and motivations of suspended drivers in a number of critical areas.

The major objectives of these analyses are :

1. to gauge how serious an offence suspended drivers consider driving with a suspended license to be compared to other motor vehicle and criminal offences;
2. to find out whether there are situations or conditions in which suspended drivers feel strongly justified in getting behind the wheel;
3. to measure levels of awareness among suspended drivers of the penalties for driving while suspended;
4. to obtain from the principal target groups reactions to different countermeasures to stop suspended drivers from driving while suspended.

9.2 SERIOUSNESS OF DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED

For the most part, survey respondents do not consider driving while suspended a very serious offence. The majority of suspended drivers consider driving while suspended more serious than only one other offence -- speeding. In fact, 51 percent of suspended drivers feel that driving while suspended is more serious than speeding, while 41 percent do not think driving while suspended is more serious than speeding. Other research dealing with highway use indicates that almost all drivers travel faster than the posted speed limit.

When driving while suspended is against the list of five vehicular and criminal offences, the ordering from least serious to most serious is as follows :

1. speeding (51% indicate driving while suspended is more serious);
2. driving while suspended;
3. failing to stop at a stop sign (41% indicate driving while suspended is more serious);
4. breaking and entering (18% indicate more serious); and,
5. drinking and driving (10% indicate more serious).

It is interesting to note that a Criminal Code violation for drinking and driving is considered the most serious offence on this list; more serious than the criminal act of breaking and entering.

Opinions regarding the seriousness of driving while suspended in relation to other offences is higher among individuals with a Probationary Demerit, Criminal Code or Medical suspension. Those who have received a Demerit, Fine Default or Other suspension tend to under-estimate the seriousness of driving while suspended.

As one would expect, those who did not drive while their license was suspended are more likely to regard driving while suspended as a serious offence. Those who knowingly drove during their suspension period are the least likely to point to the seriousness of driving while suspended. It is interesting to note that those who report that they stopped driving after being notified of their suspension sit midway between those who consciously drove and those who decided not to drive.

TABLE 29
SERIOUSNESS OF DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
<u>More serious than...</u> (% Indicating "Yes" for Each Item)							
Speeding	51	53	53	60	55	48	52
Failing to stop	41	46	39	49	54	36	41
Shoplifting	35	57	35	40	42	28	36
Breaking and entering	18	26	16	19	27	13	18
Drinking and driving	10	19	7	9	20	6	6

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Knowingly Drove</u>	<u>Stopped Driving</u>	<u>Did not Drive</u>
<u>More serious than...</u> (% Indicating "Yes" for Each Item)				
Speeding	51	41	52	59
Failing to stop	41	34	44	46
Shoplifting	35	26	29	46
Breaking and entering	18	10	15	26
Drinking and driving	10	7	8	14

9.3 WAS LICENSE SUSPENSION JUSTIFIED AS A PUNISHMENT?

In conjunction with a measure of the seriousness of the offence of driving while suspended, respondents were also asked whether or not they felt their 1986 suspension was justified. Generally, it is found that attitudes toward the seriousness of driving while suspended are accompanied by the opinion that their license suspension indeed was justified. For example, 68 percent of those with a Criminal Code suspension and 59 percent of those with a Medical suspension believe that their license suspension was justified.

Alternatively, those who do not think that a license suspension is very serious also tend to feel that the suspension of their licenses was not justified. The majority of individuals with either a Fine Default (57%) or Other suspension (63%) hold the opinion that suspension of their licenses was not justified.

Respondents who report that they did not drive during their 1986 suspension are the most likely to say that the penalty was justified (61%). Forty-six percent of those who knowingly drove admit that the Ministry was justified in suspending their license, while 53 percent believe that it was not justified. More than six in ten individuals who stopped driving after their suspension had already commenced feel that their license suspension was not deserved.

TABLE 30
WAS LICENSE SUSPENSION JUSTIFIED OR NOT JUSTIFIED?

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
Justified	50	68	54	53	59	41	35
Not justified	48	30	44	45	40	57	63
Don't know	2	2	1	3	1	1	2

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Knowingly Drove</u>	<u>Not Knowingly Drove</u>	<u>Did not Drive</u>
Justified	50	46	37	61
Not justified	48	53	61	37
Don't know	2	1	2	2

9.4 SITUATIONS WHEN A SUSPENDED DRIVER IS JUSTIFIED DRIVING

Three-quarters of survey respondents feel that they would be justified driving while suspended if they were responding to or dealing with a medical emergency. Much lower percentages would feel justified driving even if a person depended on driving for a livelihood (39%), if there were no public transit available (23%), if there were no other means of transportation such as rides from family or friends (17%), if a person were responsible for driving others (14%) or if one were to take just short trips (9%).

Individuals with a Medical suspension, more than any other suspended drivers, believe that suspended drivers are not justified driving in any situation (only 59% feel that it is permissible to drive during a medical emergency, 18 points below the average for all respondents). Respondents with an Other suspension also are less likely to believe that driving while suspended is justified. In contrast, those who had received a Demerit suspension are the most likely to say that driving is justified in all extenuating situations.

As one would expect, those who knowingly drove during their 1986 suspension are the most likely to believe that driving while suspended is acceptable under any conditions or circumstances. Those who did not drive find driving while suspended the least acceptable in any circumstance, while those who stopped driving in most instances fall in between the other two groups.

TABLE 31
SITUATIONS IN WHICH A SUSPENDED DRIVER IS JUSTIFIED DRIVING

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Fine Medical</u>	<u>Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
(% Indicating "Yes" to Each Item)							
Medical emergency	77	72	81	82	59	80	67
Need to drive for livelihood	39	38	49	46	21	39	33
No public transit	23	22	26	22	14	26	18
No other transportation	17	16	25	15	11	18	16
Responsible for others	14	15	17	15	9	14	12
Just short trips	9	9	10	7	8	10	8

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Knowingly Drove</u>	<u>Stopped Driving</u>	<u>Did not Drive</u>
(% Indicating "Yes" to Each Item)				
Medical emergency	77	87	78	68
Need to drive for livelihood	39	53	38	29
No public transit	23	35	18	17
No other transportation	17	27	9	14
Responsible for others	14	20	13	11
Just short trips	9	15	5	6

9.5 PENALTIES FOR DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED

9.5.1 Awareness and Knowledge of the Penalties

Sixty-five percent of suspended drivers indicate that they are aware of the penalties for driving while suspended. The percentages range from a high of 72 percent among those with a Criminal Code suspension to a low of 52 percent among those with a Medical suspension. Furthermore, individuals who knowingly drove while suspended generally are aware of the consequences of driving while suspended (70% awareness).

Respondents who say they are aware of the penalties for driving while suspended subsequently are asked to describe what these penalties are. Seventy-seven percent of those who are aware of the penalties indicate further suspensions, 70 percent indicate fines and 37 percent a jail term. In most instances, individuals who are convicted of driving while suspended receive an additional suspension.

Individuals who have received either a Demerit or Probationary Demerit suspension are the most likely to say that a person who is caught driving while suspended would receive a further suspension (95% and 85%, respectively). Those with a Criminal Code suspension are much more likely than others to say that the consequence of driving while suspended is a jail sentence (56%, 19 points above the average).

Among those who drove and those who did not driver, knowledge levels of subsequent penalties varies only to a small degree. Those who knowingly drove during their 1986 suspension are likely to say that the penalties would have been further suspension (79%) or a fine (78%). Among respondents who did not drive, 40 percent believe that jail terms are a consequence of being convicted for driving while suspended.

9.5.2 Opinions about the Effectiveness of the Penalties

Less than one-third of suspended drivers (29%) believe that the penalties for driving while suspended are very effective deterrents. An additional one-third (32%) feels that they are somewhat effective. Thirty-percent of suspended drivers hold the opinion that these penalties are not very effective or not at all effective methods of preventing suspended drivers from getting behind the wheel of a vehicle.

Evaluations of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the penalties for driving while suspended are relatively consistent across the six suspension groups. A slightly higher than average percentage of respondents with a Criminal Code suspension say that the penalties are very effective (36%) and a slightly higher than average number of those with a Fine Default suspension indicate that penalties are not effective (34%).

As expected, respondents who knowingly drove while suspended are more likely to say that penalties are not effective (38%) and those who did

not drive are more likely to say that penalties are effective (66%). Still, among those who knowingly drove during their suspension, the majority (53%) feel that the penalties are at least somewhat effective.

TABLE 32
PENALTIES FOR DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED BY SUSPENSION TYPE

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
<u>Aware of penalties</u>	65	72	64	56	52	64	64
<u>Knowledge of penalties (N=974)</u>							
Further suspension	77	76	95	88	67	73	79
Fine	70	58	70	72	57	76	80
Jail	37	56	23	19	39	30	45
Other	4	3	4	6	9	5	6
<u>Effectiveness of penalties</u>							
Very effective	29	36	26	29	31	25	33
Somewhat effective	32	27	33	43	25	32	29
Not very effective	18	17	21	17	19	19	20
Not at all effective	12	11	12	6	8	15	8
No opinion	9	9	9	4	18	10	10

PENALTIES FOR DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED BY WHETHER OR NOT THEY DROVE

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Knowingly Drove</u>	<u>Drove but not Knowingly</u>	<u>Did not Drive</u>
<u>Aware of penalties</u>	65	70	62	62
<u>Knowledge of penalties (N=974)</u>				
Further suspension	77	79	73	78
Fine	70	78	74	61
Jail	37	32	37	40
Other	4	2	4	6
<u>Effectiveness of Penalties</u>				
Very effective	29	20	34	33
Somewhat effective	32	33	29	33
Not very effective	18	21	17	17
Not at all effective	12	17	11	8
No opinion	9	9	9	9

9.5.3 Reasons for Ineffectiveness

Four hundred and fifty-five (455) suspended drivers who did not consider penalties to be effective subsequently were asked why they felt this way. The majority (58%) said that they did not take their suspension seriously, while 14 percent felt they were not likely to get caught, nine percent that the penalties themselves were not strict or not enforced and nine percent reported that it was necessary for them to drive and defy their suspension.

The reasons given by respondents in each of the six suspension groups do not vary by an appreciable amount. Individuals who knowingly drove while suspended are somewhat more likely to point out that they were unlikely to get caught (20%).

TABLE 33
WHY PENALTIES ARE NOT CONSIDERED EFFECTIVE
BY SUSPENSION GROUP (N=455) - MULTIPLE RESPONSES

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
Not taken seriously	58	59	57	58	62	58	56
Not likely to get caught	14	11	12	17	15	16	10
Penalties not strict or not enforced	9	9	15	6	15	10	8
Driving necessary	9	5	9	10	2	12	4
Not aware of penalties	1	4	4	3	2	-	-
Other	13	14	9	14	11	12	12

WHY PENALTIES ARE NOT CONSIDERED EFFECTIVE
BY WHETHER OR NOT THEY DROVE (N=455) - MULTIPLE RESPONSES

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Knowingly Drove</u>	<u>Drove but not Knowingly</u>	<u>Did not Drive</u>
Not taken seriously	58	47	59	73
Not likely to get caught	14	20	10	11
Penalties not strict or enforced	9	11	9	7
Driving necessary	9	12	7	6
Not aware of penalties	1	-	-	4
Other	13	17	15	4

9.6 PREVENTING SUSPENDED DRIVERS FROM DRIVING

9.6.1 Effectiveness of Different Measures

Three methods of preventing suspended drivers from driving are regarded as highly effective by survey respondents. Fifty-five percent of respondents hold the opinion that jail sentences for repeat offenders would be a very effective way of keeping suspended drivers off the road. Forty-six percent believe an increase of random police spot checks would be very effective and 42 percent indicate impounding the cars of suspended drivers would be very effective.

Less severe measures are considered to be less effective in keeping suspended drivers from driving. Thirty-four percent of survey respondents feel that notifying local police would be very effective, 31 percent increasing fines, 25 percent publishing the names and pictures of suspended drivers in the newspaper and 23 percent holding special classes and having to retake the Driver's Test.

TABLE 34
PREVENTING SUSPENDED DRIVERS FROM DRIVING

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Fine Medical</u>	<u>Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
<u>Very effective</u> (% Responding "Very Effective" to Each Item)							
Jail sentences for repeater	55	57	63	61	48	52	52
Increase spot checks	46	53	42	50	55	41	46
Impound cars	42	37	48	49	42	42	43
Notify local police	34	36	32	40	41	30	32
Increase fines	31	28	24	40	37	30	32
Publish names/pictures	25	30	27	26	30	22	25
Driver's test	23	21	25	22	33	24	26
	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Knowingly Drove</u>	<u>Stopped Driving</u>	<u>Did not Drive</u>			

9.6.2 Most Effective Measure

When respondents are asked to select the one method they believe to be the most effective in keeping suspended drivers from getting behind the wheel, jail sentences for repeat offenders is selected almost twice as often as the next most effective option (jail sentences selected by 33%). Increasing spot checks is chosen by 18 percent of respondents, impounding cars by 16 percent, special classes by 11 percent, increasing fines by eight percent, notifying local police by six percent and publishing names and pictures by five percent.

Jail sentences for repeat offenders are regarded as the most effective means of dealing with suspended drivers by respondents in each of the six suspension groups. Members of the Demerit suspension group are more likely than others to point to the effectiveness of jail sentences (46% of Demerit suspensions, 13% above the average). Alternatively, respondents who have had a Medical suspension are the least likely to believe jail sentences would be effective (5% percent below the average) and the most likely to say that publishing the names and pictures of suspended drivers would be effective (7% above the average).

It is very interesting to find that there are no major differences in the opinions of respondents who knowing drove during their suspension, who stopped driving after learning about their suspension or who did not drive at all. For each of these groups, jail sentences are regarded as the single most effective deterrent. Increasing the number of police spot checks and impounding the cars of suspended drivers are seen as the other effective methods.

There is one minor deviation from the general pattern. Twenty percent of respondents who knowingly drove while suspended feel that impounding cars is the most effective way of keeping suspended drivers from driving (4% above the average).

TABLE 35
MOST EFFECTIVE METHOD OF KEEPING
SUSPENDED DRIVERS FROM DRIVING

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
Jail sentences for repeaters	33	37	46	34	28	30	36
Increase spot checks	18	22	11	16	17	18	12
Impound cars	16	10	15	16	13	19	17
Driver's test	11	9	11	12	10	12	9
Increase fines	8	5	7	11	7	9	13
Notify local police	6	7	4	4	8	7	8
Publish names/pictures	5	7	4	5	12	4	3

	<u>All Drivers</u>	<u>Knowingly Drove</u>	<u>Stopped Driving</u>	<u>Did not Drive</u>
Jail sentences for repeaters	33	34	31	33
Increase spot checks	18	18	17	19
Impound cars	16	20	12	14
Driver's test	11	10	13	10
Increase fines	8	7	9	9
Notify local police	6	4	10	7
Publish names/pictures	5	4	7	5

9.7 PHOTO IDENTIFICATION ON DRIVER'S LICENSES

Eight of ten survey respondents feel that the photo identification on Driver's Licenses will help to prevent suspended drivers from driving. The assumption is that suspended drivers will be unable to borrow and use the license of someone else who has a valid license because of the identifying photograph.

The assessment of the photo identification as a preventive measure is most strongly endorsed by those who had a Medical suspension and by those who did not drive during their 1986 suspension. Respondents who knowingly drove are the least likely to agree to its effectiveness (68% of those who drove, 10% below the average).

10.0 POST-1986 DRIVING RECORD

10.1 INTRODUCTION

The analysis of post-1986 information from Driving Records includes individuals whose 1986 suspension ended before January 1988. In total, 3,842 drivers are included in the following analyses of suspensions, collisions and convictions.

10.2 SUSPENSIONS

Table 36 indicates that 22 percent of suspended drivers have received one or more additional suspensions once their 1986 suspension expired. The most common type of suspension received is for a fine default (17%). No other type of suspension exceeds the two percent level.

The rate at which drivers have received additional suspensions after the expiration of their 1986 suspension varies considerably by 1986 suspension group. This difference is affected by the length of time between the expiry of the 1986 suspension and the day Driver Records were retrieved in January of 1988 and, obviously, driving habits.

Drivers with a Fine Default suspension in 1986 are more likely than others to have received another suspension since their original suspension had expired. Thirty percent have since received another suspension: 26 percent have received another Fine Default suspension.

Between 21 and 23 percent of drivers with a Probationary Demerit, Demerit or Other suspension in 1986 subsequently have received another suspension. For individuals in each group, the most common type of post-1986 suspension is for a Fine Default. Also, ten percent of drivers who initially received a Probationary Demerit suspension have received another Probationary Demerit suspension.

Individuals who received either a Medical or a Criminal Code suspension are the least likely to have been suspended again (14% and 6%, respectively). Eight percent of those with a Medical suspension have received another Medical suspension.

10.3 COLLISIONS

Eleven percent of the suspended drivers from the 1986 study group have been involved in a vehicle collision. The rate of involvement in collisions varies from a high of 16 percent for 1986 Probationary Demerit suspended drivers and 14 percent for Fine Default suspended drivers to a low of seven percent of Medical suspended drivers and three percent of Criminal Code suspended drivers.

10.4 CONVICTIONS

Forty-five percent of drivers who had their licenses suspended in 1986 subsequently have had one or more convictions. Over one-half of Demerit suspensions (56%), Fine Default suspensions (56%), Probationary Demerit suspensions (54%) and Other suspensions (51%)

have at least one recent conviction. Only 22 percent of drivers with a 1986 Medical suspension and 14 percent of those with a Criminal Code suspension have been convicted of a driving offence since the expiration of their 1986 suspension.

TABLE 36
POST-1986 DRIVING RECORD
(N=3,842)

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Criminal Code</u>	<u>Demerit</u>	<u>Probationary Demerit</u>	<u>Medical</u>	<u>Fine Default</u>	<u>Other</u>
<u>Suspensions</u>							
1 or more	22	6	22	23	14	30	21
Criminal Code	2	2	2	2	3	3	4
Demerit	2	-	5	1	-	3	5
Probationary							
Demerit	2	-	-	10	-	1	1
Medical	-	-	-	8	-	-	-
Fine Default	17	3	16	14	2	26	11
Driving While							
Suspended	2	1	4	2	-	3	2
Other suspension	1	-	-	-	-	1	3
<u>Collisions</u>							
1 or more	11	3	13	16	7	14	10
<u>Convictions</u>							
1 or more	45	14	56	54	22	56	51

11.0 SUSPENSION GROUP SUMMARIES

CRIMINAL CODE SUSPENSION GROUP

Demographic - License Characteristics:

- * tend to be older than other suspended drivers (average 35.5 years)
- * slight over-representation in Northern Ontario
- * more commonly found in smaller communities of less than 100,000
- * one-half (51%) are married
- * lower educational standing (70% have high school education or less)
- * higher percentage of unemployed (14%) and lower household income than other suspended drivers

Current Driving Characteristics:

- * commuting to and from work is most frequent reason for driving for more than one-half of drivers in this group

Driving Record 1981 - 1986:

- * high proportion (29%) of individuals with a 1986 Criminal Code suspension have had a previous Criminal Code suspension

1986 License Suspension:

- * 83% first learned of their suspension at the beginning of the suspension period and 81% were informed of their suspension in court
- * received longest average suspension (13.7 months) among all suspension groups
- * report facing more difficulties in undertaking daily activities than other suspended drivers
- * high percentage (65%) report that they did not drive during their suspension

Driving While Suspended:

- * those who drive while suspended tend to hesitate longer before starting to drive (64% waited one month or more) than those in other groups
- * more likely than other suspended drivers to report driving less frequently and driving with more caution than usual
- * change in driving habits most influenced by the threat of additional penalties and by knowledge that they were breaking the law
- * most likely among suspended drivers to use each of the four alternative means of transportation — rides, walking or biking, taxis and public transit

Not Driving While Suspended:

- * more likely than other suspended drivers to mention license suspension as an appropriate punishment as the reason for not driving while suspended

General Attitudes:

- * seriousness of driving while suspended rated highly compared to other suspended drivers
- * most likely to believe that their license suspension was justified
- * most likely to say they are aware of penalties for driving while suspended and most likely to mention a jail sentence as a penalty
- * most likely to feel that the penalties are effective

Post - 1986 Driving Record:

- * least likely among suspended drivers to have been suspended again (6%)
- * least likely to have been in a collision after their 1986 suspension (3%)
- * least likely to have been convicted of a driving offense after their 1986 suspension (14%)

DEMERIT SUSPENSION GROUP

Demographic - License Characteristics:

- * highest percentage of males (97%) among suspension groups
- * over-representation in Western and Northern Ontario
- * highest percentage of motorcycle license holders (27%)

Current Driving Characteristics:

- * tends to drive more frequently and drive greater distance per week than most other suspended drivers
- * tends to drive for work-related reasons and one-half rely on driving for their livelihood
- * has above average confidence in driving ability

Driving Record 1981 - 1986:

- * one-third (32%) received a Fine Default suspension between 1981 and 1986
- * highest percentage (69%) having previous involvement in a collision among all suspension groups
- * all members of Demerit group have had at least one previous conviction and have highest average number of convictions from 1981 to 1986 (8.5 convictions)

1986 License Suspension

- * average length of suspension was 2.2 months
- * two-thirds (65%) learnt about their suspension at the beginning of the suspension period
- * four in ten (42%) admit to driving while suspended

Driving While Suspended:

- * most likely among all suspension groups to have started driving because of work-or school-related activities
- * high probability of changing some aspect of driving patterns, especially driving less often, driving more cautiously and driving more slowly
- * above average rates of encountering a police spot check (14%) and being stopped for a traffic violation (15%) while under suspension

Not Driving While Suspended:

- * most likely to cite additional penalties as reason for not driving while under suspension (81%)

General Attitudes:

- * most likely to believe that driving while suspended is justified in all extenuating circumstances
- * most likely to say that an individual caught while driving under suspension would receive an additional suspension (95%)
- * most likely to mention jail sentences for repeat offenders as the most effective method of preventing suspended drivers from driving

Post-1986 Driving Record:

- * high percentage (56%) have had at least one traffic conviction since the end of their 1986 suspension

PROBATIONARY DEMERIT SUSPENSION GROUP

Demographic-License Characteristics:

- * youngest group of suspended drivers (mean age of 23.5 years)
- * highest percentage of single, never married individuals (78%)
- * high percentage with low educational standing (70% with high school education or less)
- * over-representation of part-time workers (16%) and students (12%)
- * have been driving in Ontario for the shortest length of time among suspended drivers (average 4.3 years)

Current Driving Characteristics:

- * most likely to be driving for school-related purposes

Driving Record 1981 - 1986:

- * least likely among all suspended drivers to have received a previous suspension (25% have one or more previous suspensions)

1986 License Suspension:

- * seven in ten (72%) first learned of their suspension at the beginning of the suspension and were most likely of all groups to report having been notified by letter (82%)
- * shortest average suspension length (1.6 months)
- * low percentage admit to or were caught driving while suspended (22%)

Driving While Suspended:

- * more likely than other suspended drivers to alter their normal driving habits while driving under suspension
- * 90% report driving less often
- * most likely to report driving more cautiously (81%), driving more slowly (63%) and changing their normal travel routes (29%)
- * lowest rate of police contact during 1986 suspension (11%) among all suspended drivers

Not Driving While Suspended

- * less likely than other suspended drivers to mention license suspension as an appropriate punishment as a reason for not driving while suspended (38%)

General Attitudes:

- * tend to view driving while suspended as very serious in relation to other offenses
- * high percentage (85%) say that a further suspension would follow a conviction for driving while suspended

Post - 1986 Driving Record:

- * 23% of those who received a Probationary Demerit suspension in 1986 have since received another suspension and 10% have received another Probationary Demerit Suspension
- * more likely than other suspended drivers to have been involved in a vehicle collision following the end of their 1986 suspension (16%)
- * more than one-half (54%) have had at least one subsequent traffic conviction

MEDICAL SUSPENSION GROUP

Demographic - License Characteristics:

- * highest percentage of woman (19%) among all suspension groups
- * oldest suspension group with a mean age of 49.6 years
- * over-representation in Eastern Ontario
- * highest proportion of married individuals (59%)
- * highest percentage of homeowners (62%)
- * highest percentage reporting no other licensed drivers in the household (32%)
- * three in ten (31%) are retired and high percentage (35%) are earning less than \$20,000 in household income per year
- * highest proportion of individuals (27%) working in professional or managerial occupations among all suspension groups
- * have driven longest average amount of time in Ontario among all suspended drivers (12.7 years)

Current Driving Characteristics:

- * tend to drive less often per week than those in other suspension groups
- * most likely to drive for personal, social or recreational reasons

Driving Record 1981 - 1986

- * three in ten had received a prior Criminal Code suspension
- * lowest proportion having a previous collision (37%) among all suspended drivers
- * lowest proportion having a previous conviction (59%, average of 1.1 convictions)

1986 License Suspension:

- * six in ten learned about their suspension at the beginning of the suspension
- * the average length of suspension was 5.7 months
- * highest percentage of all groups who did not drive while under suspension (67%)

Driving While Suspended:

- * majority (59%) waited one month or more before starting to drive
- * driving during suspension was mostly for shopping or personal reasons (30%)
- * 83% indicate that they altered their driving habits because concern about being involved in an accident
- * more likely than other suspended drivers to report using roads with fewer police (38%) and less traffic (37%)
- * more likely than other suspended drivers to have come into contact with the police while driving under suspension (26%)

Not Driving While Suspended:

- * most likely among all suspension groups to report traveling less (84%) and using public transit more (63%) because of their license suspension

General Attitudes:

- * tend to rate the seriousness of driving while suspended highly in relation to other offenses
- * majority (59%) feel that their suspension was justified
- * more likely than those in other suspension groups to believe that suspended drivers are not justified driving in any situation
- * lowest self-reported awareness of penalties for driving while suspended (52%)
- * least likely among suspended drivers to believe that jail sentences are effective deterrents to driving under suspension
- * most likely to believe that publishing names and pictures of suspended drivers and photo ID on licenses would be effective deterrents

Post - 1986 Driving Record:

- * low percentage (14%) have been suspended again after their 1986 suspension, 8% have received another medical suspension
- * low percentage have been involved in a collision (7%) or received a traffic conviction (22%) since their 1986 suspension

FINE DEFAULT SUSPENSION GROUP

Demographic - License Characteristics:

- * over-representation in urban centres of 100,000 or more
- * almost one-half (47%) have a post-secondary education
- * highest level of employment (92%) among the suspension groups
- * more than 20% work in profession or managerial occupations
- * highest proportion (34%) among suspension groups with household income in excess of \$50,000 per year

Current Driving Characteristics:

- * drives more frequently and drives greater distances per week than most suspended drivers
- * one-half indicate that driving is an essential part of their work
- * above average confidence in driving ability

1981 - 1986 Driving Record:

- * most likely among all suspension groups to have received a previous suspension (58%) and to have received a previous Fine Default suspension (44%)
- * high average number of previous convictions (4.2 convictions)

1986 License Suspension:

- * only 28% were aware of their license suspension prior to its starting date
- * 25% learned of their license suspension after being stopped by police while driving under suspension
- * least likely among suspended drivers to report difficulty in undertaking daily activities due to license suspension
- * only 17% report having to change their work situation or responsibilities while license was suspended
- * four in ten admit to driving while under suspension; only 21% state that they did not drive at any time during their suspension
- * 35% drove while unaware of their suspension

Driving While Suspended:

- * 17% received one or more convictions while driving under suspension and 4% were convicted of driving while suspended
- * most likely among the suspension groups to continue driving immediately upon learning of their suspension (66%)
- * most likely to continue driving on a daily basis (55%) and tended to drive for commuting purposes (52%)
- * four in ten admit to making no changes in their frequency of driving while under suspension

Not Driving While Suspended:

- * least likely among suspended drivers to mention license suspension as an appropriate punishment as a reason for not driving while under suspension (38%)

General Attitudes:

- * tend to under-estimate the seriousness of driving while suspended in relation to other offenses
- * majority (57%) feel that their 1986 suspension was not justified
- * a high percentage (34%) feel that the penalties for driving while suspended are not effective

Post - 1986 Driving Record:

- * more likely than all other suspension groups to have received another suspension after their 1986 suspension end date (30%); 26% received another Fine Default suspension
- * a high percentage have been involved in collisions (14%) since their 1986 suspension
- * over one-half (56%) have received one or more subsequent convictions

OTHER SUSPENSION GROUP

Demographic - License Characteristics:

- * high percentage (55%) of married individuals
- * high percentage of employed individuals (84%)
- * highest percentage of those with high school education or less (52%) among suspended drivers
- * average age of 32.4 years
- * high percentage of individuals with a motorcycle license (22%)

Current Driving Characteristics:

- * more than one-half rely on driving for earning their livelihood
- * above average confidence in driving abilities

1981 - 1986 Driving Record:

- * more than one-half (54%) have received a previous license suspension
- * one in three (31%) have received a previous Fine Default suspension
- * six in ten (60%) have had at least one collision between 1981 and 1986
- * high average number of previous convictions between 1981 and 1986 (5.7 convictions)

1986 License Suspension:

- * faced more difficulties than other suspension groups in undertaking daily activities
- * 45% lost their job or were forced to change their work responsibilities because of their license suspension
- * one-third (34%) knowingly drove while under suspension, 28% drove while unaware of their suspension and 37% stated they did not drive under suspension

Driving While Suspended:

- * 11% were convicted of a traffic offense during their suspension
- * six in ten (62%) drove immediately after learning of their suspension
- * 43% continued to drive on a frequent basis while under suspension and 28% drove as often as normal

Not Driving While Suspended:

- * concern about breaking the law and concern about being involved in an accident were more important reasons for not driving to those in the Other suspension group than to other suspended drivers

General Attitudes:

- * tend to underestimate the seriousness of driving while suspended in relation to other offenses
- * highest proportion of individuals feeling that the suspension of their license was not justified (63%)

Post - 1986 Driving Record:

- * 51% have had at least one conviction since the end of their 1986 license suspension

APPENDIX A - METHODOLOGY

METHODOLOGY

During the period of March 10 to April 14, 1988, Environics Research Group conducted a survey of 1,511 Ontario drivers who had their driver's license suspended in 1986.

Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire used in this survey was designed by Environics Research Group in consultation with the Safety Coordination and Development Office of the Ministry of Transportation.

The questionnaire required an average of 19 minutes to administer to respondents.

Sample Design

The sampling method was designed in order to complete 1,500 interviews among six separate groups of suspended drivers (Criminal Code, Demerit, Probationary Demerit, Fine Default, Medical, Other). It was necessary to produce a sample design which would provide information within each group as well as a representative sample of all suspended drivers in Ontario.

The sample design combines a proportional design with an equal-cell design. The combined technique creates sufficient cell sizes in the smallest suspension groups while minimizing the weights to produce a representative sample.

Combined Proportional/Equal-Cell Sample Design

<u>Suspension Group</u>	<u>Actual Number</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Weight</u>
Fine Default	49,805	51	504	1.5
Criminal Code	25,128	26	316	1.2
Probationary Demerit	15,037	15	239	1.0
Medical	3,389	3	150	0.3
Demerit	3,268	3	150	0.3
Other	1,985	2	140	0.2
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	
TOTAL	98,612	100	1,500	

Telephone Interviewing

The survey was conducted by experienced telephone interviewers from Environics' central location telephone facility in downtown Toronto.

Field supervisors were present at all times to ensure accurate interviewing and recording of responses. All responses were direct data entered in Environics' in-house mini-computers using the DASH computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) system. This system

provides for automatic editing to ensure complete and accurate recording of responses. For further quality control, ten percent of the interviews were unobtrusively monitored on-line in accordance with the standards of the Canadian Association of Market Research Organizations (CAMRO).

Completion Results

A total of 1,511 interviews were completed. The number of interviews completed by suspension group were:

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Fine Default	506	33
Criminal Code	317	21
Probationary Demerit	245	16
Demerit	152	10
Medical	150	10
Other	141	9
<hr/>		
TOTAL	1,511	100

The effective response rate for the survey is 45 percent (the number of completed interviews, 1,511, divided by the total sample, 3,354, minus non-valid/not eligible numbers, 664, and the numbers not in service, 418). The table below presents the detailed results.

<u>Completion Results</u>		
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Number of Calls	4,436	100
<hr/>		
Non-valid/Not eligible	664	15
Number not in service	418	9
Subtotal	1,082	24
<hr/>		
New Base (4,436 - 1,082)	3,354	100
<hr/>		
No answer/Line busy/Respondent not available	1,467	44
Language barrier	52	2
Incomplete interview	41	1
Refusal	283	8
Subtotal	1,843	55
<hr/>		
Net Completions (3,354 - 1,843)	1,511	45

The margin of error of a sample of 1,511 is plus or minus 2.5 percent at the 95 percent confidence level.

APPENDIX B - QUESTIONNAIRE

FINAL DRAFT SUSPENDED DRIVERS QUESTIONNAIRE

I - BACKGROUND INFORMATION : DRIVING BEHAVIOUR/CHARACTERISTICS

First, we would like to ask you some questions about your typical or usual driving habits.

1 - How frequently would you say that you drive a vehicle? Is this...

Daily or almost daily
Several times a week
About once or twice a week
2-3 times a month
Once a month or less
Do not drive (vol'd) — GO TO Q.2

2 - Would you mind telling me why you aren't driving now?
ASK FOR MAIN REASON IF MORE THAN ONE

License suspended
Medical reasons
Car/vehicle no longer available
Have stopped driving permanently/temporarily
Other reasons SPECIFY _____

GO TO Q.7

3 - Thinking of a typical week, about how many kilometers (or miles) do you usually drive? Do you drive...

Less than 50 km per week
Between 50 and 100 km per week
Between 100 and 250 km per week
Between 250 and 500 km per week
Between 500 and 1,000 km per week
More than 1,000 km per week

4 - What is your usual or most frequent reason for driving? Is it for...

Going to and from work
Travelling or driving as part of your job
Going to and from classes
Pleasure trips, recreational activities, visiting family or friends
Shopping or attending to personal business
Other (Specify) _____

5 - DRIVERS WHO ARE NOT CURRENTLY LICENSED (from driver record)
Do you have reason to believe that you are currently disqualified
from driving?

Yes

No

GO TO Q.11

6 - THERE IS NO QUESTION 6

7 - Prior to the (suspension of your driver's license)/(time you
stopped driving), how frequently would you say that you drove a
vehicle? Was this...

8 - Thinking of a typical week, about how many kilometers (or miles)
did you usually drive? Did you drive...

9 - What was your usual or most frequent reason for driving? Was it
for...

10 - THERE IS NO QUESTION 10

11 - Are you...

Working full-time

Working part-time

Going to school and not working

A homemaker

Unemployed, laid off

Retired

-
-
-
-
-

GO TO Q.13

12 - Other than driving to and from work, do you need to drive as part
of your job? For example, do you drive a taxi or a truck?

Yes

No

13 - (When you were driving,) How would you rate your skills as a
driver? Would you consider yourself to be an above average driver,
an average driver or a below average driver?

Above average

Average

Below average

II - HAVING A DRIVER'S LICENSE SUSPENDED

The following questions concern having your driver's license suspended. The information that we received from the Ministry of Transportation indicates that your driver's licence had been suspended in _____ (INSERT MONTH) of 1986. Please refer to that period of time when answering the following questions.

14*- Did you find out your driver's license had been suspended...

Prior to or right at the beginning of that period, or
After your suspension had already started
Not until suspension had ended (vol'd)

15*- How did you first learn that your license had been suspended? ONE ONLY - DO NOT READ

Letter
Court order, judge — GO TO Q.18
Stopped by police
Unable to renew license
Introductory letter from this survey
Other (SPECIFY) _____

RESPONDENTS WHO WERE UNAWARE OF SUSPENSION GO TO Q.23e

16 - Did you return your license to the Ministry or surrender your license when you learned about your suspension?

Yes — GO TO Q.18
No —

17*- THERE IS NO QUESTION 17

18 - In your opinion, did you feel that suspending your license was justified or not justified?

Yes, justified — GO TO Q.20
No, not justified

19 - Why do you say that the province was not justified in suspending your license?

20 - Because your license was suspended, did...

You lose your job or were you forced to change what you did at work? Yes/No
You drop out of school or miss classes? Yes/No

21 - Because your license was suspended, was it very difficult, somewhat difficult or not very difficult...

For you to meet your social obligations?

For you to do everyday activities such as shopping or attending to personal business?

For you to do your regular leisure or recreational activities?

For your family to get around?

22*- Were there any other ways were you inconvenienced?

Yes (SPECIFY) _____

No

23 - RESPONDENTS AWARE OF SUSPENSION FROM START

Many people still drive even though their licenses have been suspended. For the period between _____ (INSERT START MONTH/YEAR) and _____ (INSERT REINSTATEMENT MONTH/YEAR) when your license was suspended, did you, for any reason, happen to drive a vehicle? This would include driving even once or making a short trip.

Yes — GO TO SECTION III

No — GO TO SECTION IV

b) IF CONVICTED OR ACCIDENT DURING SUSPENSION AND "NO" TO Q.23

The information provided by the Ministry indicates that you had contact with the police while driving during your suspension period. To the best of your knowledge, is this information correct?

Yes, correct

No, incorrect — GO TO SECTION IV

c)* RESPONDENTS AWARE OF SUSPENSION AFTER START

Were you driving during your suspension period up to the time you found out about your suspension?

Yes

No

d)* Many people drive even after learning their licenses have been suspended. After finding out your license had been suspended and before _____ (INSERT REINSTATEMENT MONTH/YEAR) did you, for any reason, happen to drive a vehicle? This would include driving even once or making a short trip.

Yes — GO TO SECTION III

No — GO TO SECTION IV

29a- Other than how often you drove, did you make any other changes in your usual driving habits. For example, did you...

Drive more cautiously	Yes/No
Drive more slowly than usual	Yes/No
Drive on roads with less traffic	Yes/No
Change routes from your normal pattern	Yes/No
Change the time of day when you drove	Yes/No
Drive on roads with fewer police	Yes/No

PRE-TEST ONLY

b) Did you happen to make any other changes in your driving habits?

30*- RESPONDENTS WHO CHANGED THEIR DRIVING HABITS FROM Q.29
Was _____ (INSERT REASON FROM BELOW) a very important, somewhat important or not very important reason for changing your normal driving habits during your suspension?

Being worried about being caught by the police.
Concern about additional penalties for driving while suspended.
Being worried about getting into an accident.
The fact that you would be breaking the law.
Having family and friends telling you to change your driving habits.

31 - What other means of transportation did you use because your driver's license was suspended?

Did you get rides from family or friends?	Yes/No
Did you take public transit more often?	Yes/No
Did you take a taxi more often?	Yes/No
Did you walk or ride a bike as an alternative?	Yes/No

32 - Did you come into contact with the police for any of the following reasons when you were driving while suspended?

R.I.D.E. or police spot checks	Yes/No
Traffic violation	Yes/No
Accident, collision	Yes/No
Mechanical breakdown	Yes/No

IF NO TO ALL, SKIP TO Q.35

33 - Did the police check to see if your license was suspended?

Yes
No — GO TO Q.35

34 - Did the police...

SKIP TO Q.35 WHEN FIRST YES RESPONSE RECORDED

Charge you with driving while suspended? Yes/No

Give you a formal suspension notice? Yes/No

Give you a verbal warning? Yes/No

Do nothing related to your suspension? Yes/No

GO TO SECTION V

35*- THERE IS NO Q.35

36*- THERE IS NO Q.36

IV - NOT DRIVING WHILE SUSPENDED

37 - What other means of transportation did you use because your driver's license was suspended?

Did you get rides from family or friends? Yes/No

Did you take public transit more often? Yes/No

Did you take a taxi more often? Yes/No

Did you walk or ride a bike as an alternative? Yes/No

Did you just travel less? Yes/No

38 - Was _____ (INSERT REASON FROM BELOW) very important, somewhat important or not very important in deciding not to drive while your license was suspended?

Being worried about being caught by the police.

Concern about additional penalties for driving while suspended.

Being worried about getting into an accident.

The fact that you would be breaking the law.

The fact that the suspension was appropriate punishment.

Having family and friends telling you not to drive.

Knowing someone who got caught when they were driving while suspended

39 - THERE IS NO Q.39

40 - THERE IS NO Q.40

V - THE OPINIONS OF SUSPENDED DRIVERS

41 - Are you aware of the penalties for being caught while driving with a suspended license?

Yes
No

42 - What are these penalties?
CODE ALL THAT APPLY

Further suspension
Fine
Jail
Other
DK/NA

IF NO TO Q.41 OR OTHER OR DK/NA TO Q.42, INFORM RESPONDENT THAT PENALTY IS USUALLY A FURTHER SUSPENSION AND A FINE OR JAIL SENTENCE

43 - In your opinion, how effective are these penalties in preventing suspended drivers from getting behind the wheel? Do you think they are...

Very effective
Somewhat effective
Not very effective
Not all effective
Depends (Volunteered)

b) IF NOT EFFECTIVE
Why do you say that the penalties are not effective?

44 - Are there situations when a suspended driver is justified driving?
Do you think a suspended driver is justified driving...

In a medical emergency	Yes/No
If that person's livelihood depends on driving	Yes/No
If that person doesn't have any other way of getting around	Yes/No
If that person is going to make just short trips	Yes/No
If that person is responsible for driving other family members	Yes/No
If there is no public transit available	Yes/No

45 - Would _____ (INSERT FROM BELOW) be very effective, somewhat effective or not at all effective in preventing suspended drivers from driving?

Making jail sentences mandatory for repeat offenders
Publishing the names and pictures of suspended drivers in the local newspaper
Increasing the amount of fines
Notifying their local police (OUTSIDE METRO ONLY)
Requiring all suspended drivers to attend special classes and take the Drivers Test again
Increasing the number of random spot checks by police
Impounding the cars of suspended drivers

46 - Which do you think would be the most effective method? (VERY AND SOMEWHAT FROM Q.45)

LIST FROM ABOVE

47*- Soon all Ontario drivers will have a photo I.D. on their license to prevent drivers from using someone else's license. Do you feel that this will help to prevent suspended drivers from driving?

Yes
No

48*- In your opinion, do you think that driving with a suspended license is more serious than...

Shoplifting
Breaking and entering
Drinking and driving
Failing to stop at a stop sign
Speeding

VI - DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

49 - In what age category may I place you?

- 16 - 19 years
- 20 - 24 years
- 25 - 34 years
- 35 - 44 years
- 45 - 54 years
- 55 - 64 years
- 65 - 74 years
- 75 and over

50 - IF LESS THAN 18

Do you live with a parent or guardian?

- Yes — GO TO Q.52
- No — GO TO Q.51

51a- Do you own or rent your present accommodation?

- Own
- Rent

b) IF LESS THAN 18

When you drive, do you use a vehicle that you...

- Personally own or lease
- Borrow from your parents
- Borrow from a friend or relative
- Get from the company you work for

52 - How many other licensed drivers are there in your household?

|__| Drivers

53 - WORKING FULL- OR PART-TIME

What kind of work do you do?

- Sales or clerical (secretary, clerk, bookkeeper, bank teller, salesperson)
- Professional or technical (doctor, lawyer, engineer, teacher, clergy, librarian)
- Operative (operate some kind of machinery, e.g. truck or cab driver, welder, dress cutter, parking attendant)
- Laborer (construction worker, longshoreman, warehouse worker)
- Manager or administrator (executive, store manager, farm manager, government administrator)
- Craft or skilled worker (carpenter, electrician, radio/TV technician, auto mechanic, baker, factory supervisor)
- Service worker (barber, beautician, police officer, cook, housekeeper, practical nurse)

54 - What is the highest level of education that you have reached?

Elementary school
Some high school
Completed high school
Community college, vocational, technical school, CEGEP
Some university
Completed university
Post graduate, professional
No schooling

55 - What is your marital status? Are you ...

Single, never married
Married or common-law
Widowed
Separated, or
Divorced

56a- What language do you usually speak in your home?

English
Language other than English (SPECIFY) _____

b) IF LANGUAGE IS NOT ENGLISH

Would you prefer to have future correspondence from the Ministry
in _____ (LANGUAGE FROM ABOVE)?

Yes
No

57 - Do you live in a community with a population...

More than 500,000 people
Between 100,000 and 500,000
Between 10,000 and 100,000
Less than 10,000

58 - For statistical purposes only, we need information about your
income. All individual responses will be kept confidential.
Please tell me which category applies to your **total household**
income for 1987.

Under \$20,000
\$20,000 to \$30,000
\$30,000 to \$40,000
\$40,000 to \$50,000
More than \$50,000

59 - Note sex :

Male

Female

60 - Region from Postal Code

